

INFANT  
BAPTISM

MILLER

Agnew of the Theological Seminary,  
PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No. ....

SCB  
10183

C. 1

22  
mt





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2011 with funding from  
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1872, by  
SOUTHWESTERN BOOK & PUBLISHING CO.,  
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.



## INTRODUCTION.

---

There are two extreme views with respect to the Church, each of which is false and mischievous. In one view, the Church has official custody of the grace of God, which it dispenses by authority, through sacramental channels of communication. In the other, the Church is made nothing of, or next to nothing. Connection with it is held to be of little or no value. Its ordinances and means of grace are slighted as nothing worth.

It is true, beyond all question, that a man's relations with his Maker are to be determined by himself. He can confer no "power of attorney" upon the Church to attend to the business of salvation for him. He must come to God in his own person. In the vital process of repentance and faith, and in the mystery of the new birth, no proxy can be employed. Yet it is also true that God has ordained in the Church many efficient aids, many means of grace, through which the earnest penitent, and the more advanced believer, are alike strengthened and helped

forward in the Christian race. The fellowship of saints and the ordinances of religion quicken the spiritual perception and sensibilities, and encourage and strengthen faith.

The mere fact of membership in the Church exerts a most wholesome effect on the mind and heart. Of course, like all other aids and means of grace, it loses its effect upon the conscious and deliberate hypocrite, for all the means are, to us, what we make them by our manner of using them. Perversely and hypocritically used, they harden. But when used in the candor and simplicity of a genuine faith they are an invaluable agency in the development of the Christian life. Not that the Church confers salvation officially through them; but their use, in keeping with the laws of our being, quickens faith, and commits us openly and formally to a Christian course. God makes them a blessing through a process altogether rational. In the same way the very fact of membership in the Church gives strength to our purposes. It separates us openly and formally from the world. It classifies us with the people of God. It brings home to us our high privileges, and puts us into a category altogether favorable to the service of God. It enforces upon our attention all the motives of piety.

It is not a matter of small consequence what relation our children shall sustain to the Church; whether

they shall come upon the arena of that contest in which eternal life is lost or won, in their place in the militant host, or enter it single-handed and without support.

The whole question of the relation of children to the Church is involved in the doctrine of infant baptism. This book is devoted to the discussion of the various questions involved in this doctrine. The matter has appeared in a series of articles in the "St. Louis Christian Advocate." These articles have been read with great interest and beneficial effect. The author, though a young man, has already attained to eminence in controversial writing. It requires no sanguine temperament to hope for the accomplishment of much good by the publication of this book.

There is a demand for it. Several large denominations of Christians in our country are strangely heretical upon this subject. The popular mind has, to a considerable extent, been infected by false ideas. What with the heresy of baptismal regeneration on one side, and that of anti-pedobaptism on the other, there is need for a widespread presentation of the "truth as it is in Jesus." Controversy for its own sake is undesirable, but when the interests of truth demand it it is not to be shunned. The incidental ill-feeling that may arise is to be regretted, but we

must "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints."

There is much shameful neglect of children by the Church and by Christian parents. The best possible results of Christian training are rarely realized, for the reason that the training itself is imperfect. A thorough course of training, where there is a due blending of authority, affection and Christian teaching on the part of parents, and the proper care and influence on the part of pastors, with prayer and faith, would breed up a style of Christian now rarely seen among us.

This training, to answer to the divine ideal, must be based on baptism and the covenant therein entered into by the parent for the child. On what a vantage ground is that child placed who has been brought into covenant with God by its parents.

The parental relation is greatly disparaged and degraded, so far, at least, as religion is concerned, by those who oppose infant baptism. They deny the authority of the parent to make a covenant for his child. How totally they misconceive the nature of the parental relation. The fact is, that during infancy the parent *does everything for the child*, and is obliged to this by the very facts in the case. He must believe for the child and act for him in every interest, even the most vital. The child is in his hands, incapable of acting for itself, and *he must act for it, or*

*let it perish.* The responsibility is on him, and he cannot avoid it. What food it shall eat, what atmosphere it shall live in, what medicine it shall take, he must determine. Nor does he make a title-deed in which he does not *covenant for his child as well as for himself.* If you say a man cannot enter into covenant for his child, you contradict nature itself, and the customs of mankind from the earliest ages.

If a man may not bind his child by a covenant *in the matter of religion*, it is an exception to the authority he holds in all civil relations. If this be so, an advantage is lost to the child *in this highest of all interests*, that is secured to it in all other cases. The *mature business judgment* of the father may be made available in the temporal interests of the child—not in the way of advice merely, but of actual covenant transactions which are to inure to his benefit. But as to his soul, he may be bound by no stipulations, so that the intelligent and *mature faith* of the father are not available in any such substantial way for his spiritual wealth and safety. The very instance in which we would expect a gracious God to secure to the child the highest advantages of this relation, according to this unnatural theory, is the instance in which he is to reap no benefit from it whatever.

Where the filial feeling is properly evolved there is the deepest sense of obligation and honor in respect

to the fulfillment of any covenant made by the parent. Let this feeling be properly fostered in the child, and then let him be trained to understand the force of the obligations that rest upon him from the baptismal covenant, entered into on his behalf by his parents, and you have a class of motives to a Christian life of the most commanding character. These motives are totally wanting in the case of children unbaptized.

My neighbor says, "I will not bind my child in the affairs of his soul. He shall be *free*. He shall *choose for himself*." This is quite taking to the popular ear.

But I say, my child shall *not* be free to go wrong, either in religion or anything else, if I can help it—and more emphatically in religion than in anything else. I will bind him by commands, by covenants, and by all the most sacred obligations, to serve God. I will environ him with motives that he shall feel it to be unnatural and monstrous for him to disregard. I will make it in the highest degree difficult and painful for him to go to hell.

To this view of the case the Church must be brought. There is much need of light amongst us upon this subject. Our own Church needs toning up greatly. Thousands in the Church use little or no authority to turn the young, unpracticed feet of their children from the way of death. Many Methodists are incurring heavy guilt in this very thing.

The recent agitation of this subject in Kentucky and Missouri has done good—great good. Let it be followed up by the dissemination of a sound literature, and by thorough pastoral instruction. This book appears at a good time, and will be gladly received by all intelligent and earnest-minded parents.

May it have a wide circulation, and bring many to the knowledge of the truth on this particular point. Let it be understood, moreover, that the duty of offering our children to God in baptism is not the *whole* truth. The value of baptism to a child is found in the fact that it is the starting point in a course of Christian training. Its chief value is in its relation to the subsequent training. Its significance is in this relation. If a thorough Christian training does not follow, then the value and significance of the baptism are never realized.

There is need of a great awakening of the parental conscience.

E. M. MARVIN.

ST. LOUIS, March 26, 1872.





# INFANT BAPTISM.

---

## ARTICLE I.

At the request of very many friends, I propose to write a series of papers on Infant Baptism, setting forth the argument as I understand it. The importance of this subject in itself, independent of the vast difference which it creates between the religious denominations of this country, makes it worthy of a patient and prayerful consideration. The papers which I propose to write on the subject shall be short and strictly *ad rem*—epitomizing and sifting down the matter of the argument so as to enable the popular mind to appreciate the central points of the argument.

I shall occupy the present paper with a statement of my *Methods of Proof*, and thus indicate in advance the line of argument to be developed. The numerous works which I have examined on this subject are very faulty in this regard. No definite *aim* seems to be before the writers. The reader finds himself, consequently, beating about in a vast sea of mate-

rials, uncertain as to what port he is to reach. Some writers begin at one end of the argument, others at the other end, and still others in the middle. Some open with the *objections* to infant baptism, others with objections to the theory that opposes infant baptism. The result of this *rudderless, compassless* effort to navigate this sea of facts is, that the reader soon loses sight of the author and interest in his subject, and then lays down the book, indifferent whether he goes down amid the icebergs of the Arctic seas or strands upon Cimmerian shores.

We would avoid this evil. Therefore we shall state clearly *how*—by what *method*—we propose to vindicate what we believe to be taught in and authorized by the Holy Scriptures on the matter before us.

There are three methods of proving a proposition, *e. g.:* (1) A command; (2) An authoritative example; (3) An induction. We shall employ these methods of proof in this investigation. We, therefore, proceed to an explanation of these methods of proof, and to indicate how we shall apply them.

(1) *A command.* Thus: "Do this or that." This is our first method. We propose to show a *command* for infant baptism. Now, to determine to whom a command extends it is not necessary to fix or determine the *age*, or *sex*, or *name* of the party contemplated. The only thing necessary to be determined

in order to ascertain whether the command extends to this, that, or the other one, is to determine whether they belong to *the class* contemplated in the command. For example, in the Lord's Supper the command is, "Do this in remembrance of me." Here neither *age*, *sex*, nor *name* is contemplated, but all who "remember" Christ are included in the command, "Do this." Now, it is only by the recognition of this rule that we can justify the giving of the Lord's Supper to women. We shall have occasion to examine this matter more at length hereafter. Let it, therefore, suffice at this point to say that at the institution of the Lord's Supper none but men were present; no instance is on record in which it is stated that a woman partook of the Lord's Supper; and in all statements with reference to that institution, such as Acts xx. 7, 1 Cor. xi. 28, words are used which definitely distinguish the male from the female. Upon what authority, then, do we give the Supper to women? Where is the command? We can only answer, and the answer is sufficient, they are included in the *class*—namely, of those who "remember" Christ, to which class the command, "Do this," is given. Therefore they are entitled to the Lord's Supper, for it is an axiom that "whatsoever is commanded of a *class* may be commanded of each individual in that class." We shall apply this method of

proof to infant baptism, thus: In Matt. xxviii. 19-20, we are commanded, "Go ye therefore and teach (or disciple) all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," &c. Now, the only thing to be determined is, do infants belong to the *class* here contemplated in the command? The class is "*all* nations." Are infants any part of that class? If so, then the command to baptize them is as imperative as it is to baptize any others that belong to that class. We shall not anticipate here the usual objections which anti-Pedobaptists raise at this point. That shall be attended to in due time. We simply indicate now our line of proof.

(2) *An authoritative example.* *E. g.*, has any proper authority done the thing in question? Have those who have been set forth by the Head of the Church as an "*ensample*" in practice for the Church done this thing? The force of this as a method of proof can not be well over-estimated. Some of the most solemn and oft-repeated ordinances of religion have been set aside, and new ones substituted in their room by an authoritative example in the absence of any command or enactment in the case. Take but one instance. No ordinance was more solemn or more oft-repeated than the holy Sabbath—the fixing of the *seventh* day as a holy day. When God finished

the work of creation, He “blessed the seventh day and sanctified it” (Gen. ii. 3), and when the Decalogue, the basis of all moral law, was given at Sinai, He embodied the law of the Sabbath in that; and on through succeeding ages the blessings of heaven were poured upon the man who “remembered the Sabbath day to keep it holy,” and terrible curses fell upon him who secularized or despised that day. No enactment stands upon the holy page for the abrogation of that law of the Sabbath, and no command was ever given by Christ to substitute another day in its room. And yet the Church, for eighteen centuries, has secularized the seventh day, doing all manner of work therein, and in the stead of the *seventh* day it has “remembered” the *first day* “to keep it holy.” Now, upon what authority does the Church do this? That there is no command for it, all agree; that it sets aside the day which God appointed from the beginning, is perfectly plain; and that this thing, in the absence of any command, is done with “a conscience void of offense toward God and man” by the holiest men the Church has ever had, is equally true. Where, then, is the authority? We answer, it is to be found only in the *example of the apostles* and of the *Church* in its purest ages. Their *example* is esteemed by us as of sufficient authority to justify us in no longer remembering “the *Sabbath* day to keep it holy,” and

in keeping a day which, numerically, is as far from the seventh as is possible—*the first*.

Now, we shall apply this rule (an authoritative example) to the argument on infant baptism, thus: About *one-third* of the instances of baptism in the New Testament—a history embracing more than thirty years of apostolic labor—are instances of household, or, family baptisms, and those *family* baptisms expressed by a word which narrows the signification of *household* down to the *father, mother and children*, which make up a family. Here is an authoritative example. We shall also see that the Church, from the apostles on through the purest ages of its existence, practiced infant baptism with an unanimity never exceeded in any item of faith and practice which the Church has held. If, therefore, the example of the apostles and of the Church in the first centuries can authorize the setting aside of the *Sabbath* day, and the substitution therefor of the *first day*, their example can authorize infant baptism.

(3) *An induction.* This is a legitimate method of proof, and by it a demonstration may be as infallibly made as by any other known process of argumentation. By induction we mean, that process of argumentation in which we ascend from the parts to the whole, and from general analogy or special presumptions in the case form conclusions. This is Bacon's

method in science. It is that method of proof upon which many of the most sacred rights and most momentous interests of this life depend. Take, for example, the rights or basis of property. *Law* does not fix the right or basis of property, though, as Wayland says, "the existence and progress of society, nay, the very existence of our race, depends upon the acknowledgment of this right." Now, our knowledge of the rights of property is obtained simply by an induction. We make an induction (1) of natural conscience, and (2) of general consequences, and thus determine the question as to the right of property.

I shall apply this method of proof, thus: I shall take the *covenant of grace*, the great organic law of Christ's kingdom, and the *relation of children* to Christ's kingdom ("of such is the kingdom of God"), and by an induction of these establish the rightfulness of infant baptism.

I have thus indicated the line of argumentation, the methods of proof, which I propose to follow. I may not confine myself to the exact *order* in which I have stated these rules, but they shall be the headlands toward which I will constantly steer, the paths in which I shall walk. The reader, therefore, who may desire information upon this important subject, may now follow us, intelligently and satisfactorily, to the conclusions which we propose to reach.

## ARTICLE II.

## HISTORIC EVIDENCE—THE PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH.

Whence the *practice* of infant baptism? This is a perfectly natural question. Is it an innovation? If so, it had a beginning somewhere and by some one. But *when*, *where*, and by *whom*? Is it true that the opposers of infant baptism charge that it is an innovation, and yet utterly fail, with the history of the whole Church before them, to fix *when*, *where*, and by *whom* so great an innovation came in? This failure is not without significance. If it were an innovation, history would have recorded the name of the innovator, where he lived, and when he began the practice; and those who have succeeded in cultivating in themselves and in their followers so strange a disgust for the practice, would not have been slow in announcing the record to the world. Their failure to produce reliable history to sustain their assumption, that infant baptism is an innovation, is the more remarkable when we consider the fact that the *fathers*—the reliable writers of the first centuries of the Christian era—have transmitted to us full and minute accounts of the origin of the various heresies and innovations which arose from time to time. Thus, Tertullian, of the second century, has transmitted a list of the innovations of his time; Irenæus,

who was born about A. D. 120, wrote a volume of nearly 500 pages *against heresies*, which has come down to us; Hippolytus, who was born about A. D. 200, wrote ten books against "All Heresies." In these and similar works the innovations which crept into the Church are carefully catalogued. Hence, it is not a difficult task to give the *name*, and the *place*, and the time of each innovator. For example: *Extreme Unction* was introduced by the Marcosians in the second half of the second century; *penance* came in about A. D. 225; *exorcism*, *insufflation*, touching the ear of the baptized, and the *sign* of the cross, &c., in the second and third centuries (See Schaff., Hist. Chr. Church, vol. 2, p. 486). Leo the Great was the first Pope (Ibid., p. 316-17). The Mass was introduced by Gregory in the sixth century; the Collyridians introduced the worship of the Virgin Mary in the close of the fourth century; image worship and purgatory came in about the same time. It is needless to extend this list, as it might be done almost *ad infinitum*. These instances are sufficient to show the fidelity of history in preserving a record of innovations.

Now, the introduction of all these strange notions and practices excited fierce controversies, and often civil commotions, which lasted for many years. Is it, therefore, possible that infant baptism, one of the

greatest and gravest innovations, according to the testimony of its opponents, could have come into the Church without exciting a single notice from any one of the many writers in the Church, and without awakening one moment's controversy on the subject? Never was there a more impossible assumption! Where were all the Baptists and Campbellites of those days? Is it not marvelous that one of them did not preach a sermon or write a pamphlet against what they now spend half their time in opposing?

I shall now proceed to show that while the silence of the grave hangs upon the opposition to infant baptism in the first centuries, the testimony of the writers of those centuries to the existence and apostolic authority of the practice is unbroken and unequivocal. By showing thus that the Church in her purest period, and the Apostles and their collaborators, practiced infant baptism, we will produce an authoritative example, which is one of the legitimate methods of proof indicated in our opening letter.

I shall now ask the reader to start with me at about the opening of the fifth century, and then, step by step, guided by true and reliable history, we will move *back* to the Apostles' time, and trace the existence of infant baptism right within the apostolic age. We will then take up the practice of the Apostles and

see that it was harmonious with the practice of the Church after their day.

*Sozomen*, A. D. 443. His Ecclesiastical History, from which I quote, is a continuation, as he tells us, of his history of events from the Ascension of the Lord to the deposition of Licinius, A. D. 324. Here is a history, then, written in the fifth century, and extending back to the Ascension. The source of information from which Sozomen drew his facts were, Clemens of Rome, Hegesippus, Africanus the historian, Eusebius, etc. On page 202, speaking of Julian the Apostate, he says: "The extravagant attachment which Julian evinced toward the Pagan rites was extremely displeasing to the Christians, more especially on account of his having been himself formerly a Christian. He was born of pious parents, had been baptized in infancy according to the custom of the Church, and had been brought up in the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, under the guidance of priests and bishops "

Here is a historian of vast information and of undoubted veracity, declaring that infant baptism was "the custom of the Church," and that declaration made in a history that goes back from the fifth century to the Ascension!

Now, on the assumption that the position of anti-Pædobaptists is true—namely, that infant baptism is

an innovation, then is it not amazing that a Church historian, who lived within 300 years of the Apostles, and who had read up the whole literature of the Church down to his time, should, in a history that goes back to the Ascension, affirm infant baptism to be “the custom of the Church?” And is it not stranger still, if possible, that no good Baptist or Campbellite historian of Sozomen’s time ever contradicted his statement and sent the facts in the case down to us? There are volumes of significance in this.

*Augustine*, A. D. 388. He was one of the most eminent men for learning the Church ever produced, and had read, according to his showing, the whole literature of the Church up to his times. Speaking of infant baptism, he says: “Which the whole body of the Church holds, as delivered to them, in the case of little infants baptized; who certainly can not yet believe with the heart to righteousness, or confess with the mouth to salvation, as the thief could; nay, but by their crying and noise while the sacrament is administering, they disturb the holy mysteries; and yet no Christian man will say they are baptized to no purpose. And if any one do ask for divine authority in this matter, though that which the whole Church practices, and which has not been instituted by Councils, but was ever in use, is very reasonably believed

to be no other than a thing delivered (or ordered) by authority of the Apostles; yet we may besides take a true estimate, how much the sacrament of baptism does avail infants by the circumcision which God's former people received" (Wall, vol. 1, p. 158). Here it will be observed that St. Augustine agrees perfectly with the historian Sozomen. They both declare infant baptism to be the universal custom of the Church. Augustine says, *Quod universa tenet ecclesia*—"which the whole Church holds." Now, consider that he lived within about 280 years of the Apostle John, and how amazing is the assumption that a dangerous innovation could in that time have become the universal practice and faith of the Church! And here was a bishop referring it to the authority of the Apostles, and yet no one knew who introduced it, or when, or where!

*Pelagius*, a British monk of exalted reputation, was contemporary with Augustine. His views concerning depravity and original sin were opposed by Augustine with great vehemence, and as warmly defended by Pelagius. In the progress of the controversy Augustine charged that Pelagius' views made the baptism of infants meaningless and useless. Augustine had fallen into the grave error of baptismal regeneration—baptism even for the cleansing away of original sin. Pelagius denied that there is such a

thing as "original sin." Hence infants, not having any actual guilt from personal transgression, Augustine argued that Pelagius' opinions made it useless to baptize them. It would have been greatly to the advantage of Pelagius, therefore, to show that infants should not be baptized; that it rested on no divine authority; was an innovation, &c., &c. He was a man of great learning, and had access to the history of the Church. If it had been possible, therefore, to show infant baptism to be an innovation, here was the man, and this was the time to do it. Instead of attempting such a thing, however, Pelagius said: "Men slander me as if I denied the sacrament of baptism to infants, or did promise the kingdom of heaven to some persons without the redemption of Christ; which is a thing that I never heard, no not even any wicked heretic, say. For who is there so ignorant of that which is read in the gospel, as (I need not say to affirm this, but) in any heedless way to say such a thing, or even have such a thought? In a word, who can be so impious as to hinder infants from being baptized and born again in Christ, and so make them heirs of the kingdom of heaven," &c. (Wall, I, 279.) A controversialist having the sagacity and learning which Pelagius possessed would have ransacked the entire literature of the past, and have paraded every suspicion that could have been found

against the rightfulness of infant baptism, had there existed a suspicion in his day that it was not authorized by the Bible. It was vital to his theory to disprove its divine authority. And yet he declares he never heard their right to baptism questioned!

*Chrysostom*, A. D. 380. This brings us within 280 years of the Apostles. He, speaking of baptism as Christian circumcision, says: “But our circumcision, I mean the grace of baptism, gives cure without pain, and procures to us a thousand benefits, and fills us with the grace of the Spirit; and it has no determinate time as that had [*i. e.*, that circumcision in the flesh had]; but one that is in the very beginning of his age, or one that is in the middle of it, or one that is in his old age, may receive this circumcision made without hands.” Again: “And yet some think that the heavenly grace consists only in forgiveness of sins; but I have reckoned up ten advantages of it. For this cause we baptize infants also, though they are not defiled with sin; that there may be superadded to them saintship, righteousness, adoption, inheritance, a brotherhood with Christ, and to be made members of him” (Wall, I, 143-145).

This is a statement from a source of very great authority. Chrysostom was at this time Bishop of Constantinople, the new capital of the Roman empire. His elevation was, therefore, great in the Church, and

his learning profound. He is not here arguing the rightfulness of infant baptism. There is not one line of controversy on that point in the entire history of the first thousand years of the Christian era. But he speaks of infant baptism as a fact about which there was no doubt—just as he speaks of the Church, the Lord's Supper, or any other fact in Christianity.

*Ambrose*, Bishop of Milan, A. D. 374. This was 274 years after the Apostles. He supposed that the dividing of the river Jordan by Elias was a type of baptism, and says of baptism, “by which those infants that are baptized are reformed back again from wickedness [or a wicked state] to the primitive state of their nature.” Wall, commenting on this passage, says: “He plainly speaks here of infants as baptized in the Apostles' time, as well as in his own; and makes St. John (if his meaning be to speak of the persons baptized by him), in baptizing infants for the reformation of their nature back again to the primitive purity of it, to resemble Elias in turning back the waters to their spring head . . . He does plainly speak of the baptism of infants used in the Apostles' time” (Vol. I, 139).

*Basil*, A. D. 360; *i. e.*, 260 years after the Apostles. He was Bishop of Cæsarea, and “stands high among the fathers of the Church as one of the most eloquent, energetic, and spiritual of their number” (Kitto,

Ency.). He says: "But any time of one's life is proper for baptism. Be it day or night, be it but an hour or a minute, yet the most proper time is Easter," &c. (Wall, 1, 131.) He practiced infant baptism accordingly. Theodoret, in his "History of the Church," which was written about A. D. 423, says, on page 177, that Basil directed the child of the Emperor Valens to be baptized. In the above extract from his writings he declares any period of one's life to be proper for baptism—even an hour after birth.

*Gregory Nazianzen*, A. D. 360—260 years after the Apostles. He was not baptized in infancy, because, as is abundantly evident from the most reliable sources, he was born before his father embraced Christianity. If there had been any doubt, therefore, of the rightfulness of infant baptism in his time, he would have availed himself of it in order to vindicate the memory of his father, for whom he always expressed great reverence. He thus expresses himself with reference to baptism: "Hast thou an infant-child? Let not wickedness have the advantage of time; let him be sanctified from his infancy; let him be dedicated from his cradle to [or by] the Spirit. Thou, as a faint-hearted mother and of little faith, art afraid of giving him the seal because of the weakness of nature." He is here reprimanding any,

who, through a misapprehension of the saving effects of baptism, might be disposed to defer it until late in life, or until the approach of death. Tertullian, in the second century, had advocated such a delay in baptism. Gregory, however, urges the giving of "the seal," or baptism, "in infancy," or "from the cradle."

*Optatus*, Bishop of Milevi, A. D. 360, calls baptism in the name of Christ "a garment," and says: "Oh! what a garment is this, that is always one and never renewed, that decently fits all ages and all shapes! It is neither too big for infants nor too little for men," &c.

*Cyprian*, Bishop of Carthage, A. D. 250; *i. e.*, 150 years after the Apostles. About the year 250 this bishop presided over a Council at Carthage of sixty-six bishops. A country bishop by the name of Fidus addressed a letter to this Council, inquiring whether an infant might be baptized at any time after birth, or whether the law of circumcision should be observed, and the baptism delayed to the eighth day. To this letter the Council, through Cyprian, the president, gave the following answer: "But in respect of the case of infants, which you say ought not to be baptized within the second or third day after their birth, and that the law of ancient circumcision should be regarded, so that you think that one who is just born should not be baptized and sanctified within the

eighth day, we all thought very differently in our Council. For in this course which you thought was to be taken, no one agreed; but we all rather judge that the mercy and grace of God is not to be refused to any one born of man . . . And, therefore, dearest brother, this was our opinion in Council: that by us no one ought to be hindered from baptism and from the grace of God, who is merciful and kind and loving to all. Which, since it is to be observed and maintained in respect of all, we think is to be even more observed in respect of infants and newly born persons, who on this very account deserve more from our help and from the divine mercy, that immediately, on the very beginning of their birth, lamenting and weeping, they do nothing else but entreat." (Cyprian, vol. I. Epis. lviii.).

Here, within 150 years of the Apostles, a Council of sixty-six bishops, representing a large portion of the Church, decide that no delay should be made in baptizing infants. Let it be observed that the question submitted to this Council by Fidus was not concerning the rightfulness of infant baptism, but whether infants might not be withheld from it for eight days. Fidus urged that "the aspect of an infant in the first days after its birth is not pure, so that any one of us would still shudder at kissing it." As, therefore, it was the custom to give the "kiss of peace" to one when bap-

tized, it seemed to him well to delay baptism until the eighth day, in order that delicacy might not be offended by having to kiss one so young. In support of his claim he urged the law of circumcision. But Cyprian and his sixty-five associate bishops promptly strike down any innovation in the faith and practice of the Church on this subject, and inform Fidus that no time was to be fixed to which the baptism of infants should be delayed. If the claim of anti-Pædobaptists be true, that infant baptism is an innovation, does not this Council exhibit the most astounding absurdity ever witnessed? For example, they, with perfect unanimity, enjoin upon Fidus a radical and dangerous innovation, which has just crept in—one that is almost to subvert “believers’ baptism”—and yet they are so scrupulous about innovations as not to permit Fidus to delay baptizing an infant until the eighth day! Who but a fanatic could believe such a thing? The Baptist historian (?!), Orchard, after miserably mutilating this epistle to Fidus, and then trying to discredit the genuineness of it, and having failed to break its force, turns to the unworthy means of aspersing the character of Cyprian. He is denounced as “an ignorant fanatic,” “a great tyrant,” as making his way to the bishopric by his wealth, as sequestering himself from persecution, &c., &c. (See vol. 1, pp. 75-76, Orchard’s Hist. Bap.) This is the

common resort of the opponents of infant baptism. When, as they invariably do, they fail in an appeal to facts, they resort to ridicule and detraction. We are inclined to expose this pretended historian, and make an example of him for the benefit of others. As to the character of Cyprian, Fox, the great martyrologist, thus speaks: "Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, was an eminent prelate, and a pious ornament to the Church. His doctrines were orthodox and pure, his language easy and elegant, and his manners graceful." (Fox's Book of Martyrs, p. 43.) This is the picture of a Christian gentleman, and is concurred in by all whose opinion is worth having. Instead of "sequestering" himself from persecution, as Orchard alleges, Cyprian suffered the loss of all his estate, which was large, in the Decian persecution, and on the 14th day of September, A. D. 258, was beheaded.

"We hardly know how to characterize such conduct as Orchard is here guilty of. It is unworthy of any cause—even as bad a one as that he was aiming to maintain. Orchard also says that Cyprian "had no such practice as infant baptism in the Church at Carthage," and that on receipt of Fidus' letter "he called together, in a private way, his brethren in the vicinity, and then he submitted the business." There is not a truth in all this statement. Let the reader reperuse the quotation from Cyprian and then judge whether

the practice of infant baptism was known in his Church. Instead of these bishops being assembled for the purpose of considering the letter of Fidus, it is plain that they were assembled upon other matters, and that Fidus availed himself of the opportunity to address them as he did; and so far was this assembly from being "a private" collection of Cyprian's "brethren," that it is most manifestly a regular Council, assembled to deliberate upon Church affairs. The opening sentence in the reply to Fidus warrants this opinion. Thus—"Cyprian and others of his colleagues who were present in Council, in number sixty-six, to Fidus their brother," &c. I deem it due the cause of truth to make this exposure of the falseness of a pretended Church history, because its statements have been re-echoed by fifth-rate prophets, who depend upon such material for their inspiration.

I shall resume in the next article the historic argument.

## ARTICLE III.

HISTORIC ARGUMENT CONTINUED—TESTIMONY OF  
ORIGEN, TERTULLIAN, IRENÆUS, JUSTIN MARTYR,  
ETC.

We now resume the argument from history, and proceed to show that infant baptism was practiced by the Church in the apostolic age without a dissenting voice. Our last witness was Cyprian and the Council at Carthage. This brought us within 150 years of the time of the Apostles.

*Origen*, A. D. 210; *i. e.*, 110 years after the Apostles. He was “the most learned and one of the most influential of the Christian Fathers. . . . His father, Leonidas, was a Christian, and suffered martyrdom for his attachment to the cause of Christ, A. D. 202.” (Kitto’s Bib. Cyc.)

Dr. Schaff says: “Epiphanius, an opponent, states the number of his [Origen’s] works at six thousand, which (continues Schaff) is, perhaps, not much beyond the mark, if we include all his short tracts, homilies, and letters, and count them as separate volumes.” He was a man of profound and extensive research. Being born in the year 185, and baptized in his in-

fancy, there must have been many still alive in the Church when he was baptized who had been brought to Christianity by the Apostles themselves. When Origen was baptized in infancy the Apostle John had been dead only about twenty-five years. His baptism, therefore, takes us within the shadow of the apostolic age. Let us now hear his testimony. He says: "Besides all this, let it be considered, what is the reason that whereas the baptism of the Church is given for forgiveness of sins, infants also are, by the usage of the Church, baptized; when, if there was nothing in infants that wanted forgiveness and mercy, the grace of baptism would be needless to them." (Wall, I. 65.) With Origen's opinion as to the design of baptism we have nothing to do. It is simply his testimony to a fact that we are concerned about. He here asserts that it was the "usage" or custom of the Church to baptize infants. If this was not a fact, every man contemporary with Origen could have contradicted it; and there was just the same opportunity for their contradiction to reach us as there was for his statement. But the fact is before us, uncontradicted, that about 120 years after the Apostles, it was the "usage of the Church to baptize infants. Origen further affirms: "For this also it was that the Church had from the Apostles a tradition [or order] to give baptism even to infants." (Ibid., I, 66.) The word

which Dr. Wall here renders "tradition or order" has not the evil sense which now attaches to "tradition." The Latin *traditionem*, which Rufinus, Origen's translator, used to translate *παραδοσις*, the word used by Origen, means "a delivering by words, teaching, instruction, delivering." (*Leverett's Lat. Lex.*) So also the original word of Origen, *παραδοσις*, means, "In N. T. meton., anything orally delivered—a precept, ordinance, instruction." (*Robinson's N. T. Greek Lex.*) Here, then, the man who within eighty-five years of the Apostles was himself baptized in infancy, whose father and grandfather were Christians, affirms that the Church had a "precept" or "instruction" from the Apostles "to baptize infants."

*Tertullian*, A. D. 200—100 years after the Apostles. It is proper to state that Tertullian had fallen into the most grievous errors concerning the efficacy of the water of baptism. He believed that when the Spirit hovered over the great deep in the beginning, he imparted to water a divine element, and that when the body came in contact with water in baptism, it absorbed, in some mysterious way, this divine element. Hence, in his opinion, the water of baptism did of itself, cleanse away all pollution. As a matter, therefore, of safety, he advised the delay of baptism of all persons until the most dangerous periods of life were passed, lest if they should fall into grievous sins after

baptism there should be no hope for them, as baptism could not be readministered. Hence, says he, "For no less cause must the unwedded also be deferred—in whom [the ground of] temptation is prepared, alike in such as never were wedded by means of their maturity, and in the widowed by means of their freedom [from the nuptial yoke]—until they either marry, or else be more fully strengthened for [maintaining] continence. If any understand the weighty import of baptism, they will fear its reception more than its delay; sound faith is secure of salvation." (De Baptismo, chap. xviii.)

This explanation is necessary to a proper understanding of the quotation following: "And so," says Tertullian, "according to the circumstances and disposition, and even age, of each individual, the delay of baptism is even preferable; principally, however, in the case of little children." (De Baptismo, chap. xviii.) He did not oppose the rightfulness of infant baptism, as anti-Pædobaptists have frequently represented him; he only did in their case what he did in the case of "the unmarried," "widows," and all in whom "the ground of temptation is prepared"—namely, advised the delay of baptism as a matter of expediency. Here, then, is a distinguished writer, who was born about A. D. 150, speaking of infant baptism as an existing fact. He utters no word

against its rightfulness. He simply advises its delay, as he does also in the case of adults, as a matter of expediency. I can not refrain from again exposing the unchristian conduct of the opponents of infant baptism. The Baptist historian, Orchard, fabricates the following with reference to Tertullian: "Tertullian was inquired of by a rich lady named Quintilla, who lived at Pepuza, a town in Phrygia, whether infants might be baptized on condition that they asked to be baptized and produced sponsors. In reply to Quintilla, Tertullian observes, 'That baptism ought not to be administered rashly, the administrators of it know.'" (History of Baptists, vol. I, pp. 69-70.) Now, what will the candid reader think when, with Tertullian's works (from which Orchard pretends to quote) open before us, we assure him that there is not one word of truth in this whole story? The entire thing is a fabrication. The remotest allusion to such a story is not found in his works! Orchard's intention evidently was to create the impression that this was the first suggestion of infant baptism made to Tertullian's mind, and that he promptly rejected that. How desperate must be a cause which throws itself upon such expedients for support!

*Clement of Alexandria*, A. D. 192—92 years after the Apostles. He was a distinguished writer and teacher in the Church. His works which have come

down to us exhibit great calmness and moderation. His work before us, *The Pædagogus*, is largely devoted to instructing men and women concerning the gravity and modesty to be cultivated in all the affairs of life—*e. g.*, apparel, ornaments, &c. Referring to the custom of wearing rings on the fingers with seals or devices graven on them, he inveighs against the custom of putting lascivious pictures and devices for such seals, and advises as follows: “And let our seals be either a dove or a fish, or a ship scudding before the wind, or a musical lyre which Polycrates used, or a ship’s anchor, which Seleucus got engraved as a device; and if there be one fishing, he will remember the apostle, and the children ( $\piαιδιών$ ) drawn out of the water.” Or, as Dr. Wall translates: “And if any one be by trade a fisherman, he will do well to think of an apostle, and the children taken out of the water.” (Pæd. B. III, chap. xi.) Wall, who is received as the highest authority by all on the history of infant baptism, remarks upon this passage: “An apostle’s taking, or drawing, or lifting a child out of the water, can not refer to anything that I can think of, but the baptizing of it. And *infantem de fontem levare* [to raise an infant from the font] is a phrase used by the ancients, denoting the baptizing of it, almost as commonly as the word baptizing itself.” (Wall I, 53.) This, in Clement, is but an allusion to the existing

fact of infant baptism; but, as Wall says, "Such transient supposals of a thing, and taking it for granted, are in an ancient author rather plainer proofs of its being then generally used or known, than a larger insisting on it would be." Within ninety-two years, then, of the Apostles' time, infant baptism is referred to as a well-known fact, and made to illustrate other topics of religion. But how could such references have been made if the custom did not prevail, and receive the sanction of the Church? With reference to "the drawing of the child out of the water," it may be proper here to state the manner of baptizing infants in the East, where customs remain the same from age to age. The "Report to the Board of Missions of the Prot. Epis. Ch., U. S.," by Rev. Dr. Jarvis, says: "The priest then asks the name of the child, and taking him on his left arm, and supporting his feet with his right, he puts him into the font, his head being kept out of the water. Then, with the hollow of his hand, he pours water upon the child three times, baptizing him," &c. (Chapin Prim., chap. 80.) This is an account of the manner of baptizing among the *Armenians*. The same is also stated of the *Syro-Jacobites*, *Copts* and *Abyssinians*, and other Eastern Christians. An apostle, therefore, "drawing a child out of the water," was simply lifting its feet out of the font.

*Irenæus.* He was born about A. D. 120, and wrote

the book from which we quote about A. D. 182. He was born within about twenty years of the Apostles' time. He was a disciple of Polycarp, who was a disciple of the Apostle John. Concerning Polycarp, Irenæus thus speaks: "Polycarp also was not only instructed by the Apostles, and conversed with many who had seen Christ, but was also, by the Apostles in Asia, appointed Bishop of the Church in Smyrna, whom I also saw in my early youth, for he tarried [on earth] a very long time, and when a very old man, gloriously and most nobly suffering martyrdom, departed this life, having always taught the things which he had learned from the Apostles, and which the Church has handed down, and which alone are true." (Ire. B. III, 4.) Schaff says of Irenæus: "He enjoyed in his youth the instruction of the venerable Polycarp of Smyrna. Through this link he still was connected with the Johannean age. The spirit of his preceptor passed over to him." (His. Chr. chap. I, 488.) Such, therefore, was his contiguity to the Apostles, and such were his opportunities for knowing their practice, that whatever he says upon this question should be received as conclusive. We quote him: "For He [Christ] came to save all through means of himself—all, I say, who through him are born again to God [*renascuntur in Deum*] infants, and children, and boys, and youths, and old men. He, therefore,

passed through every age, becoming an infant for infants, thus sanctifying infants; a child for children, thus sanctifying those who are of this age, being at the same time made to them an example of piety, righteousness, and submission," &c. (Irenæus *Adv. Hæreseos*, B. II, chap. xxii. 4.) The only thing to be explained in the phrase "born again to God," or "regenerated to God." That Irenæus meant baptism by regenerate, is true beyond reasonable doubt. In book III, chap. xvii, he uses "baptize" and "regenerate" as interchangeable terms. "And again, giving to the disciples the power of regeneration into God, he said to them, 'Go and teach all nations, baptizing them,'" &c. Regenerate was so used by all the Fathers—e.g., Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, &c. Wall and Lightfoot show that it had been so used by the Jews before and during the time of the Apostles, and even the strongest opponents of infant baptism admit that Irenæus so used the word. Thus Alexander Campbell says: "Well, now it comes to pass that I represent all the primitive Fathers as using the term regenerated as equivalent to the term baptized. All this is true; and what then? . . . . But on a more accurate and strict examination of their writings [the Fathers'] and of the use of this term in the New Testament, I am assured that they used the term regenerated as equivalent to immersion, and

spoke of the spiritual change under other terms and modes of speech." (Rice and Campbell Debate, 430.) This is the testimony of a bitter opponent of infant baptism. Wall says: "The ancients, when they speak of regeneration as applied to a person in this world, do always by that word mean, or connate, his baptism." (I, 47.) The evidence is, therefore, absolute and overwhelming, that Irenæus meant baptism by regenerate. We hear him, then, declare that "infants" are "baptized to God." Let it be remembered that this is the statement of a man who was the disciple and pupil of the venerable Polycarp, who was the disciple and pupil of the Apostle John. We have already seen that Origen, who was born in A. D. 185, was baptized in infancy. (See Wall and Schaff.) Hence, as Irenæus wrote the book from which we quote, about eighty-two years after the Apostles' time, this statement was made while the Church was unquestionably practicing infant baptism, as in the ease of Origen. Now, is it to be presumed that right there, under the shadow of the Apostles, and while their disciples were still living—such men as Polycarp, who willingly gave up their lives for the truth of Christianity—that under such circumstances a grievous innovation came in, and the holiest and truest men in the Church submitted to it? Never was there a more absurd conceit!

*Justin Martyr*, A. D. 140—40 years after the Apostles. This eminent man in the Church often speaks of baptism as “spiritual circumcision,” recognizing thereby the same relation of baptism to the Church and its members as that which circumcision sustained. On this subject he says: “And we, who have approached God through Him, have received not carnal, but spiritual circumcision, which Enoch and those like him observed. And we have received it through baptism, since we were sinners, by God’s mercy; and all men may equally obtain it.” (Dia. with Trypho, chap. xlivi.)

It was the belief of these Fathers, as it has been of the Church at all times, that baptism takes the place of circumcision in the Church, and consequently is to be administered to infants just as that was. In the light of these truths we are now prepared to understand the following statement by Justin: “And many, both men and women, who have been Christ’s disciples from childhood remain pure at the age of sixty or seventy years.” (Justin Martyr’s First Apology, chap. xx.)

It is not a little remarkable that Justin uses the same word here for disciple (*εμαθητευθησαν*) that Matthew uses in the commission. (Matt. xxviii. 19.) Now, it is conceded on all sides that baptism is one of the essential items in discipling persons to Christ;

and from the office of baptism in the Christian economy as Justin understood it—being the same as circumcision—it can not be doubted that he meant to say these persons were baptized to Christ in childhood— $\piαιδων$ —infancy. Now, persons seventy years old in Justin's time who had been baptized in infancy, were baptized only about thirty-six years after the Ascension of Christ. This was, consequently, right in the Apostles' time. Schaff says of Justin: “He expressly teaches the capacity of all men for spiritual circumcision by baptism; and his  $\piασιν$  [all] can with the less propriety be limited, since he is here speaking to a Jew, and as he elsewhere (in his smaller *Apolo-gy*) speaks of old men who have been from childhood disciples of Christ.” (His. Chr. Ch. I, 402.)

*Hermas Pastor.* It is generally believed that this work was written before the Apostle John wrote his Gospel (Vid. Wall, I, 34), and consequently it conducts us inside the Apostolic age. The book is a religious allegory, in which the Church is represented as a tower in process of building. I shall only give a summary statement of the line of reasoning observed by the author. The foundation of the tower, or Church, is “the Son of God.” (Chap. xii.) The “tower” built thereon “is the Church.” (Chap. xiii.) The stones of which the tower was built were taken from “twelve mountains” (chap. i.), which repre-

sent the “twelve tribes which inhabit the whole world.” (Chap. xvii.) As the stones are taken from the mountains to be placed in the building, the “Seal,” which is baptism, is applied to them. (Chap. xvi.) Now, the question is, have children any place in this tower, or Church? We quote in answer: “And they who believed from the twelfth mountain, which was white, are the following: they are as infant children, in whose hearts no evil originates; nor did they know what wickedness is, but always remained as children. Such, accordingly, without doubt, dwell in the kingdom of God, because they defiled in nothing the commandment of God; but they remained like children all the days of their life in the same mind. All of you, then, who shall remain steadfast, and be as children, without doing evil, will be more honored than all who have been previously mentioned; for all infants are honorable before God, and are the first persons with Him.” (Chap. xxix.) It is only necessary to let the mind run over the contents of the chapters above given to see the bearing of this statement on the question before us. Here was a “tower”—the Church; it was built by stones taken from “twelve mountains”—the nations; to each “stone,” as it was placed in the tower, the “Seal” was given—baptism; the most honorable persons in this “tower,” or with the owner of it, who is God, are “infants.” Was the

“Seal” given to the less honorable, and withheld from those who were more worthy? This would be absurd. We claim, therefore, that here is reliable testimony, carrying us back within the Apostolic age, and asserting infant baptism and infant Church membership. In view of this unbroken historic line, Dr. Schaff says, in his great “History of the Church,” vol. I, p. 401: “But at the same time it seems to us a settled fact, though by many disputed, that, with the baptism of converts, the optional baptism of the children of Christian parents in established congregations, comes down from the Apostolic age.” There is no fact in the history of the Church better attested than that of infant baptism. In the first one thousand years of the Church’s history there is not a voice raised against it. On the contrary, we have now seen that Sozomen, A. D. 443; Augustine, 388; Chrysostom, 380; Ambrose, 374; Basil, 360; Gregory, 360; Cyprian, 250; Origen, 210; Tertullian, 200; Clement, of Alexandria, 192; Irenæus, 160; Justin Martyr, 140; and Hermas Pastor, before John wrote his Gospel—all proclaim it as the practice of the Church.

The testimony of these writers is the more remarkable from the fact that there could not have been any collusion between them. They were separated from each other by continents and oceans, as well as

centuries of time. Still their voice is one. I shall close this chapter by referring to some rules as laid down by the distinguished legal writer, Simon Greenleaf, LL. D., for fourteen years the colleague of Chief-Justice Story, and afterward the honored head of the most distinguished school of English law in the world. He says: "Every document, apparently ancient, coming from the proper repository or custody, and bearing on its face no evident marks of forgery, the law presumes to be genuine, and devolves on the opposing party the burden of proving it to be otherwise." (Greenleaf on Testimony of the Evangelists, p. 7.) We present in court, then, the depositions of fourteen unimpeached witnesses, testifying to infant baptism back to the days of the Apostles. Let our opponents disprove these documents or forever abandon the absurd charge of innovation. If it be an innovation, when did it come in? If it be not an innovation, it was practiced by the Apostles. This we propose to show in our next.

## ARTICLE IV.

## APOSTOLIC PRACTICE—APOSTLES EDUCATED IN INFANT BAPTISM.

Having traced the practice of infant baptism back to the very days in which the inspired Apostles lived and taught, and having seen that these early writers in the Church do almost constantly refer to the Apostles as authority in this matter, it is proper now to examine the practice of these holy men and ascertain what there was in their practice to warrant these statements of the Fathers. In prosecuting this inquiry, we shall first call attention to the fact that whenever, in the ministry of the Apostles, the head of a family was converted to Christianity, it is expressly stated that the family thereof was baptized, and the word for family is carefully selected to express the idea of father, mother and children. We will show, in the second place, that these Apostles were reared and educated under the constant practice of the Church to baptize all, including infants, who were proselyted to the true faith.

In the ministry of the Apostles we have the record of ten baptisms; *e. g.* (1) Two without families—Paul and the Eunuch.

(2) Five are records of large assemblies, collected together in some instances on a sudden—as Pentecost, &c.

(3) Three are of families—the family of Stephanas, 1st Cor. i. 16; the family of Lydia, Acts xvi. 15; the family of the Jailer, Acts xvi. 33. Nearly one-third, therefore, of the baptisms recorded of the Apostles were of families. Now, in expressing these family baptisms, a word was carefully selected which narrows the signification down to the father, mother and children of a home. This is worthy of notice. There are two words in the Greek which are indiscriminately rendered, in our version, “household.” This, we think, should not have been. The words in question are, (1) *oikia* (*oikia*), and (2) *oikos* (*oikos*). The first word, *oikia*, includes in its meaning servants, attendants, friends, and any others who may be attached to a family. This word is never used in speaking of household or family baptism.

The second word, *oikos*, means the family proper, excluding servants, attendants, &c. This word is always used to express family baptism, except in Acts xvi. 33, where its equivalent is used. We have only to show that such distinction in these words exists. This we proceed to do. In 1st Cor. i. 16, it is said that Paul “baptized the household—*oikov*—of Stephanas,” and in 1st Cor. xvi. 15 it is said that the “house”

—*oikiaν*—of Stephanas “addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints.” Now, what reason is there for this change of words in this case if there be no difference between them? The facts simply are, that in 1st Cor. i. 16, Paul baptized the family proper of Stephanas—father, mother and children, and in 1st Cor. xvi. 15, a few years after, domestics or others attached to the family of Stephanas, “addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints.” Here, then, when the family proper is spoken of, *oikos* is used, and when those not properly of the family are spoken of, *oikia* is used. Again: In Numbers xvi. 27-32, we read: “And Dathan and Abiram came out, and stood in the door of their tents; and their wives, and their sons, and their little children. And the earth opened her mouth, and swallowed them up, and their houses —*oikovς*—and all the men that appertained unto Korah, and all their goods.”

Here, “the wives, the sons and the little children of these men are called their *oikos*—their family; while others who were attached to the family, but were not properly of it, are called “the men that appertained unto Korah.” Here, then, in the very Scriptures from which the Apostles drew their religious phraseology, that word which they used to express “household” baptism is employed carefully to express simply the father, mother, “sons and little

children." When it is remembered that these Apostles drew their religious phraseology from the Old Testament Scriptures (quoting in their epistles, as they constantly do, from the Greek version of the O. T.), it is very significant that they should, in every instance, select a word to express "household" baptism which in the O. T. so expressly includes "the little children" of the family. Our position with reference to these words is ably sustained by learned critics. Thus, Bloomfield on 1st Cor. i. 16, says, "*οικος*, 'family,' including every age and sex, and, of course, infants." He cites an example from Ignatius in proof. It is as follows: "I salute the households—*οικους*—of my brethren with the women and children." Thus, by the Greek Fathers, *oikos* was used to designate the family proper, including the infants thereof. Dr. Summers says: "The term *οικος* (*oikos*) means family as distinct from *οικια* (*oikia*) household." (Baptism xxxii.) Now, with the fact settled beyond reasonable doubt, that the word used in the New Testament to designate "household" baptism, does thus carefully exclude all but father, mother, "sons and little children," let us examine the record.

Acts xvi. 15. "And when she was baptized, and her household, she besought us," &c. Here household is the same word used in Numbers xvi. 32, in which "the little children" are mentioned as being

included. The learned inform us that the Peshito-Syriac translation, which some eminent critics believe was made in the first century, while the Apostles were still living, and none, I believe, place it later than about the close of the second century, renders this passage thus: "She was baptized, and her children." Not only then does the inspired writer use a word in speaking of the baptism of Lydia's family, which includes "the little children," but the oldest translation in the world of that inspired statement, is that her "children" were baptized also. This is conclusive.

\* Acts xvi. 33. "And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straightway." It is true that *oikos* is not employed here; but it is equally true that *οἱ αὐτοῦ παντες*, "all his," is here put as the equivalent of *oikos*—family. All the old English translators so understood it. Thus, Wicklif, 1380, renders it, "and alle his hous;" Tyndale, 1534, has it, "was baptized with all that belonged unto him;" Cranmer, 1539, renders it, "and all they of his household;" the Geneva version of 1557, "with all that belonged unto him;" and the Rheims version of 1582 has, "and all his house." The critics so understand it. Lange says: "They [the Apostles] returned that act of love by another, when they baptized him and his family at the same water." They baptized his family just as

they a day or two before had baptized Lydia's family. When we consider, as we presently shall, the education of these Apostles with reference to infant baptism and Church membership, such expressions cannot be misunderstood.

First Cor. i. 16. "And I baptized also the household of Stephanas." The word for household here is *oikos*. This, as we have seen, means the immediate family, and was so used by Paul in many instances. Thus, giving instruction to bishops, he says: "One that ruleth well his own house, *oikov*, having his children in subjection with all gravity; for if a man know not how to rule his own house, *oikov*, how shall he take care of the Church of God." (1st Tim. iii. 4, 5.) Now, upon the supposition that the infants of a family are not to be baptized, can it be conceived how the Apostle could, with propriety, use a word in speaking of family baptisms which he elsewhere employs to express the entire family, infants and all? To suppose such a thing would be to charge a culpable indifference in the use of words upon an inspired Apostle. We claim, therefore, that these facts demonstrate that the Apostles practiced infant baptism. The Fathers, who lived nearest to them, so understood it, and consequently they speak, again and again, of infant baptism being practiced and "ordered" by the Apostles.

But, that we may still further see that these "house-

hold," or family, baptisms did necessarily involve infant baptism, let us look at the education of these Apostles and their co-laborers with reference to this thing.

We fearlessly affirm that no custom was more common among the Jews in the time of the Apostles, and for ages before, than the baptism of proselytes, including families and infants. If now it can be shown that these Apostles grew up and received their training amid the universal prevalence of infant baptism, of household baptisms, including infants, and of the unhesitating recognition by all of the eligibility of infants to membership in the Church, it will amount to demonstration that they practiced infant baptism, when, in accordance with this their training, they went forth proselyting the nations and baptizing families.

We ask the reader, therefore, to accompany us in the examination of some authorities establishing the custom of proselyte and infant baptism among the Jews.

*Maimonides*, a learned Rabbi and commentator on Jewish law, says: "A stranger that is circumcised and not baptized, or baptized and not circumcised, he is not a proselyte till he be both circumcised and baptized; and he must be baptized in the presence of three," &c. Again: "Even as they circumcise and baptize strangers, so do they circumcise and baptize

servants that are received from heathens," &c. (Wall I, 3, 4.)

*Lightfoot*, speaking of John's baptism, says: "But yet the first use of baptism was not exhibited at that time. For baptism, very many centuries of years backward, had been both known and received in most frequent uses among the Jews—and for the same end as it now obtains among Christians—namely, that by it proselytes might be admitted into the Church; and hence it was called baptism for proselytisms." Again, he says: "All the nation of Israel do assert, as it were with one mouth, that all the nation of Israel were brought into the covenant, among other things, by baptism. 'Israel (saith Maimonides, the great interpreter of the Jewish law) was admitted into the covenant by three things—namely, by circumcision, baptism and sacrifice,' &c. Again: "Whenever any heathen will betake himself, and be joined to the covenant of Israel, and place himself under the wings of the divine majesty, and take the yoke of the law upon him voluntary, circumcision, baptism and oblation are required; but if it be a woman, baptism and oblation. That was a common axiom: No man is a proselyte until he be circumcised and baptized. . . . They baptized also young children (for the most part with their parents). 'They baptize a little proselyte according to the judgment of the Sanhedrim.' (Bab.

Erubhin.) . . . ‘This is to be understood of little children, who are made proselytes together with their father.’ . . . If an Israelite take a Gentile child, or find a Gentile infant, and baptize him in the name of a proselyte, behold, he is a proselyte.” (Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. et Tal., vol. II, pp. 54-57.)

Here it is made manifest that proselyte baptism existed in the Church many centuries before the time of the Apostles, and that the infant children of proselytes were always baptized with their parents. Household baptisms, therefore, including infants, were just as common among the Jews as household circumcision. Dr. Lightfoot, who had read up exhaustively the entire literature of the Hebrews, says that “all the nation of Israel do assert, as it were with one mouth, that all the nation of Israel were brought into the covenant, among other things, by baptism.” What, now, we ask, could have been the construction, and the only construction, which a Jew would place upon the language of Luke and Paul when they again and again speak of baptizing “the household” of such and such persons? Unless we assume that a nation did, in a day, change its whole religious phraseology, without any reason appearing why they should do so, we must admit that the Jews, to whom these inspired documents were directed, and the Apostles who wrote them, must have understood such expressions as

“household” or “family baptism” in the same sense in which those phrases had been used for ages—namely, as including infants. Horne lays it down as a universal rule, that “The received signification of a word is to be retained, unless weighty and necessary reasons require that it should be abandoned or neglected.” (Introduction Pt. II, 335.) But no such “weighty and necessary reasons” have ever been adduced by our opponents showing why Paul and others used those phrases in a different sense from that which they had borne in all the literature of all the ages of the Hebrew people.

If it were necessary to substantiate the statements of Lightfoot and Wall concerning this practice of proselyte infant baptism, we might array, almost without end, the names of the most distinguished scholars of the past and present, who affirm the same. We will give a few as samples.

Kitto’s Cyclo. Bib. Lit., vol. III, Art. Proselytes. “According to the Rabbins, baptism was even more essential than circumcision. . . . When a proselyte had young children, these were baptized with their parents. . . . Assuming that they practiced that rite before, we can account for their not giving it up simply because the Christians had adopted it; but, trace it as we please to Jewish customs and rites, it seems utterly incredible that after it had become the

symbol and badge of the religious party, which of all others, perhaps, the Jews most bitterly hated, any consideration whatever should have induced them to begin to practice it. On the other hand, we have, in favor of the hypothesis that proselyte baptism was practiced anterior to the time of our Lord, some strongly corroborative evidence. We have, in the first place, the unanimous tradition of the Jewish Rabbins, who impute to the practice an antiquity commensurate almost with that of their nation. Secondly, we have the fact that the baptism of John the Baptist was not regarded by the people as aught of a novelty, nor was represented by him as resting for its authority upon any special divine revelation. Thirdly, we have the fact that the Pharisees looked upon the baptism both of John and Jesus as a mode of proselyting men to their religious views (John iv. 1-3) and that the dispute between the Jews and the sons of John's disciples about purifying, was apparently a dispute as to the competing claims of John and Jesus to make proselytes." We give so much of this valuable article because it expresses so concisely the views of the learned world. To the names already given might be added those of Selden, Danze, Witsius, Kuincel, Jahn, Halley, Buxtorf, Schötgen, Wetstein, Furst, Mosheim and Schaff.

If, therefore, learning and the literature of a people

can establish anything, or is worth anything in determining the customs of a people, then it is established that proselyte infant baptism was the universal custom of the Hebrews in the days of the Apostles, and had been for ages. Now, under these influences, these Hebrew men, who were made the Apostles of Christ, were reared and educated. There had never been a suspicion in their minds against the eligibility of infants to a place in the Church and to the token of covenant relation ; they had witnessed the baptism of families, including infants, whenever a Gentile father or mother sought a place among God's Israel ; their Divine Master had uttered no syllable indicating that a change in this respect was to characterize their practice ; and now, with such an education, and from the midst of this universally prevalent custom, they go forth to proselyte the "nations" to Christ, and in this work nearly one-third of the baptisms recorded of them are of "households" or "families." Logic and common sense leave but one conclusion to be drawn—namely, that they baptized infants, as their fathers had done through the ages past.

There is one point in this question of Jewish proselyte baptism which it may be well here to notice, because our opponents, in their despair, invariably run to it. They tell us that no such thing as baptism is commanded in the inspired laws of the Hebrews ; and

that if baptism was added by the Hebrews at any time before Christ, it was an innovation, and consequently heretical. This is the best they can do in setting aside this custom. But this cavil may be successfully exposed and refuted in many ways.

Thus, for example, when the Passover was instituted no mention is made of wine as any part of the elements of the Passover Supper. The Paschal "lamb," "unleavened bread" and "bitter herbs" are the only things mentioned in the institution of that solemn feast. (See Ex. xii. 1-10.) And yet, when Christ ate the last Passover with his disciples, and of it instituted his Supper, wine was an essential part in that Passover, and Jesus recognized the rightfulness of its being there when he used it in the institution of His Supper. In like manner, if we were to admit that no mention of baptism is made in the law concerning a proselyte, still here was the custom of baptizing them, extending back to the remotest periods in Hebrew history, and Christ recognizes its rightfulness in that he enjoins upon his Apostles to baptize all whom they proselyte to him. But there is divine authority for the existence of baptism among the Hebrews anterior to the Apostles. Thus, Paul says of their ordinances, "which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings (*or baptisms, βαπτισμοις*), and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation." (Heb. ix. 10.)

Here it is plainly declared that He who imposed the ordinances of "meats and drinks" upon the Hebrews, also imposed the ordinance of "divers baptisms." Again: "Moreover, brethren, I would not have you ignorant how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all *baptized* (*βαπτιζω*) unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." (1st Cor. x. 1, 2.) Here, "the whole nation of Israel" was baptized when they came out of Egypt. "And when they came from the market, except they wash (or *baptize*, *βαπτισωνται*), they eat not. And many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as the washing (or *baptism*, *βαπτισμος*) of cups, and pots, brazen vessels, and of tables." (Mark vii. 4.) We have seen from Heb. ix. 10 that these baptisms were "imposed" on them by the same authority that imposed the ordinances of "meats and drinks"—namely, Jehovah. Baptism, therefore, was of divine appointment among the Hebrews, and that baptism was given to infants.

Men, therefore, who had been educated under this divinely appointed rite, and who had witnessed it through their entire lives, would have required special instruction from the Master, and the most explicit commands, before they could have been brought to practice contrarily. Witness, for example, the difficulty there was in inducing Peter "to go to the Gen-

tiles," whom he had been taught by his religion to regard as unclean. God had not only to give an express command, "Get thee down, and go with them" (Acts x. 20), but he had to work a wonder, in the vision of "the sheet," before the religious training of this Jew could be overcome. And after all this had been done, Peter went to Cornelius with these words, "Ye know how that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company, or come unto one of another nation." (Acts x. 28.) Now, in the face of such facts, the opponents of infant baptism would have us believe that these Apostles, educated and developed in all their religious life under the practice of infant baptism, whenever a Gentile family was proselyted, themselves went forth to proselyte the Gentile world, and, without one hint or suggestion from the Master, abandoned in their practice that which they had been educated to believe an essential feature of religion. The thing is too absurd to be entertained for a moment.

Let us now run back over the argument from an authoritative example. We have seen that in the first four centuries of the Christian era the voice of history is uniform in regard to the practice of infant baptism. We traced it inside the Apostolic age. Here is the practice of the Church in its purest age. We have seen that the Apostles, who were reared and educated

under the universal prevalence of infant baptism, did always baptize the whole family when the head thereof received Christ; and that in the education of the Apostles such family baptisms always involved the baptism of infants. We have seen that the proselyte baptism among the Hebrews, which included that of infants, was not an innovation, but of divine appointment, as certified to by St. Paul, in Heb. ix. 10. Now, if the opponents of infant baptism were called upon to produce one-half the authority for setting aside the "seventh day" as a holy day, and for substituting therefor the first day of the week, that is here produced for infant baptism, they could not do it to save the world! And yet, with an effrontery which is absolutely shocking, they declare that infant baptism has no divine warrant!

We shall take up in our next our first method of proof—namely, a divine command.

## ARTICLE V.

THE COMMISSION A POSITIVE COMMAND—UNDER IT  
“LITTLE CHILDREN” ARE TO BE RECEIVED “IN  
THE NAME OF JESUS.”

We have stated that one method of proving a proposition is a *command*—“Do this or that.”

But how shall we determine to whom such a command extends? It is perfectly obvious that a command may, and often does, extend to parties not named in it. In the event, then, of a controversy as to whether a certain party is contemplated in a given command, how could it be satisfactorily determined? Simply by ascertaining whether that party belongs to the class named in the command. This position may be fully established by reference to the Lord’s Supper. In it the command is, “Do this in remembrance of me.” Now, if one were disposed to be captious, and to confide in such arguments as the opponents of infant baptism put forth, he might urge, with great plausibility, that women are not entitled to partake of this Supper. He might urge the following considerations, which are much stronger against giving the Supper to women than anything they have put forth

against infant baptism. *E. g.*—It might be urged (1), That none but men were present when the Supper was instituted ; (2), That no mention is made by any of the inspired writers of any instance in which a woman partook of the Lord's Supper. There is not one such example ; (3), That the appellations given in the New Testament to those who partook of the Lord's Supper, such as *μαθητης*, *ἀγιος*, (*matheetees*, *hagios*), &c., are in the masculine gender ; and (4), That when the Apostle gave directions about partaking of the Lord's Supper, he employed a word which is often used to distinguish the man from the woman. Thus, 1st Cor. xi. 28, “But let a man—*ανθρωπος* (*anthropos*) examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup.” Now, the word for man here is often used to distinguish man from woman.

I will give a few examples: Gen. ii. 24, “Therefore shall a man (*anthropos*) leave his father and mother and cleave unto his wife.” Gen. xxvi. 11, “And Abimelech charged all his people, saying, He that toucheth this man (*anthropon*) or his wife, shall surely be put to death.” Gen. xxxiv. 14, “And they said unto them, We can not do this thing, to give our sister to one (*anthropo*) that is uncircumcised.” Matt. xix. 10, “His disciples say unto him, If the case of the man (*anthropon*) be so with his wife, it is not good to marry ;” xix. 3, “Is it lawful for a man (*anthropo*)

to put away his wife for every cause?" These examples might be indefinitely multiplied, were it necessary. These, however, show that when the Apostle gave direction about partaking of the Lord's Supper he used a term which signifies man as distinguished from woman. What an array a shrewd debater could thus make against permitting women to commune! And, O! if our opponents could adduce anything half so strong against infant baptism, how they would exult in it! Now, how do we determine that the command, "Do this," extends to women? In other words, how can we justify the practice of giving the Lord's Supper to them? Simply by determining whether they belong to that class to whom this command is given. What is the class? They that "remember" Jesus—"Do this in remembrance of me." Upon this, and this alone, we give the Supper to women.

Now let us apply this rule to the question under consideration. The commission as given in Matt. xxviii. 19, is as follows: "Go ye therefore and teach [or disciple] all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Here the command is, disciple, baptize; the class is, "all nations." Do infants belong to the class? Are they a part of "the nations?" If so, then the command extends to them as well as to any others of "the nations."

Let us see if the Scriptures use the expression, "the nations," so as to include infants. John xi. 50, "Now consider that it is expedient for us that one man die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not." If a "whole nation" were to perish, would the infants thereof escape? Acts xvii. 26, God "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." When God made "all nations" were infants not included? Thus it is most manifest that the very terms of the commission embrace infants—"disciple all nations, baptizing them." The very moment the opponent of infant baptism disproves the rule by which we extend the command to baptize in this commission to infants, that moment he takes away the only ground upon which he can vindicate his practice of giving the Lord's Supper to women. Here, therefore, we claim, is a positive command for infant baptism. That we may the more fully realize the force of this, let us consider the circumstances under which the Apostles received this commission. We do not understand that this commission was first given after the resurrection of Jesus. The record shows the contrary. Thus, Matt. x. 2-6, "Now the names of the twelve Apostles are these: The first Simon, who is called Peter, and Andrew his brother, &c. . . . These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them, saying, Go not into the way

of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And as ye go, preach, saying, 'The kingdom of heaven is at hand,' &c. Mark says, iii. 13-14, that he "ordained twelve, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach." Matt. x. contains just such full and complete instructions as we would reasonably expect such ambassadors to have. Here, then, is the commission as given about two years before the crucifixion. This commission authorized them to "preach" and to *baptize*. It is evident from John iv. 1-3 that they did baptize. Now, when this commission was given it limited them, in all their labors, to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Beyond this they were not allowed at that time to go. But when, after the resurrection of Jesus, "all power in heaven and in earth" was given him, he lifted this limitation, and sent them "into all the world," to "disciple" and "baptize all nations." The statement which we have, therefore, in Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, is simply an epitome of the commission as given more than two years before; and the only difference between this epitome and the full commission is, that in the full commission they are limited in their operations to the Hebrews, and in the epitome that limitation is removed.

These facts being established, we are prepared to

appreciate the bearing of this commission on infant baptism. When it was first given, it was to men who all their lives had witnessed infant baptism in the Church whenever a Gentile family was proselyted, and it sent them restrictively to a people who had practiced infant baptism, according to their own testimony, from time immemorial. When they first went forth under this commission to preach and baptize, proselyte baptism, including infants, existed everywhere among "the lost sheep of the house of Israel," to whom they were restrictively sent. Now, if this practice was to be ignored by them in their operations, every dictate of reason and safety for the future indicated this as the point at which definite instructions against the practice should have been given them. To take men whose whole religious life had been developed under the practice of infant baptism and infant Church membership, and send them to preach the "kingdom of God" to a people among whom this thing prevailed everywhere and was recognized by them as of divine appointment, and give these men no instruction against this practice, was the most direct and inevitable method of insuring heretical practices, if this thing was not to be continued, that could possibly have been chosen. But not only were they commissioned and sent, under these circumstances, to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel,"

without a hint from their Divine Master that they were to practice in this respect differently from what they had all their lives witnessed, but after his resurrection they were sent "into all the world" to disciple and baptize "all nations" upon the same commission, and without a hint that they were to abandon a practice which they had all their lives been taught was of divine appointment.

Suppose, for illustration, that their commission had read thus: "Go ye, therefore, and disciple all nations, circumcising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Now, our opponents admit the prevalence of circumcision among these Hebrews, and that every proselyte, including his infants, if he had any, was circumcised. These Apostles, then, religiously reared and educated to believe in the divine rightfulness of infant circumcision, would, under such a commission, have had no hesitancy in circumcising the infants of a family when the parents were discipled to Christ. It would have required an express injunction from the Master against this thing, and the assigning of reasons for such prohibition, to keep the Apostles from practicing it. But, according to the most undoubted source of information in the world, infant baptism prevailed among the Hebrews as extensively as infant circumcision, and the religious training of every Hebrew was just the same with refer-

ence to the one as the other. Why, then, will our opponents continue to assume that they so readily, and without instruction, abandoned the one while it required the most express commands and a long counter-education to induce them to give up the other? Such assumptions may be a fine illustration of one's adherence to his party, but it can never pass as an exhibition of intelligence and candor.

I shall at this point notice two objections which our opponents make against the position that infant baptism is authorized by this commission: (1) It is objected that my rule which extends the command to "baptize" to infants because they belong to the class named—namely, "all nations," would also extend that command to thieves, murderers, swearers, &c., because they also belong to the class, "all nations." This is simply an ingenious dodge, and its sophistry can be exposed in a moment. We have simply to ask the question—Do "thieves, murderers, swearers," &c., sustain the saved relation to Christ's kingdom that infants possess? In Matt. xix. 14 we read: "But Jesus said, suffer little children and forbid them not to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven;" and, in Mark x. 14, "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God." Whenever it can be shown that thieves, murderers, &c., have any such relation to the kingdom

of heaven as is here affirmed of "little children," then will this anti-Pædobaptist objection have some force, not before.

(2) It is objected that there are essential parts of this commission which cannot be affirmed of infants, and that, therefore, they are not embraced in it. Thus, it is said, the commission embraces "teaching," "faith," "salvation," "damnation;" an infant can not be "taught," it can not "believe," it can not be "damned," and therefore it is not a proper subject for the other item of the commission—namely, baptism. There is much sophistry in this so-called process of reasoning, which our opponents never fail to get off on this question. We propose to expose it. Let the reader get the issue fairly before him. Baptists and Campbellites affirm that infants are not proper subjects of baptism because they can not "repent," "believe," "be saved from sin," or be exposed to "damnation"—the things contemplated in the commission. Now, let us try this logic. It is an axiom in reasoning that any process of argumentation that would establish a position which is clearly against the truth, or which would support a manifest falsehood, is false and sophistical. Now, let us see if this process of argumentation, adopted by our opponents, would establish a proposition which is contrary to fact. It will not be denied that Jesus Christ was baptized, and

it will not be contended by any that he was not a suitable subject for baptism. But which of these items of the commission could be affirmed of him? Could he "repent?" He was without sin. Could he exercise saving faith? He is "the author and finisher" of it—himself the object of saving faith. Could he be saved from sin? "He knew no sin." If, therefore, no one is a proper subject of baptism but he who can "repent," "believe," be "saved from sin," &c., then Jesus Christ was not a proper subject. The objection would thus prove a falsehood, and, therefore, is in itself false and sophistical.

Again: The same objection would disprove infant circumcision. What did circumcision stand connected with in the Scriptures? We read, Acts xv. 24, "Ye must be circumcised, and keep the law." Gal. v. 3, "Every man who is circumcised is a debtor to do the whole law." Rom. ii. 25, "Circumcision profiteth, if thou keep the law." Now, could an infant at eight days of age "keep the law," and "be a debtor to do the whole law?" If the inability of the infant to exercise the "faith," "repentance," &c., of the commission proves him to be ineligible to the baptism connected with these, would not the inability of the infant to "keep the law," "be a debtor to do the whole law," &c., prove him ineligible to the circumcision connected with these? Thus the sophistry of

this objection is dissipated. When our opponents try to reason upon this question they outrage all the rules of logic and of common sense.

Thus they assume that when the Scriptures say "repent and be baptized," or "he that believeth and is baptized," repentance and faith are required of all in order to baptism. But we have seen that this is untrue. Jesus Christ was baptized, but not upon the condition of faith and repentance. Faith and repentance are required in the Scriptures for salvation, but will infants be damned because they can not exercise these? It is required in the Scriptures that "if any would not work, neither should he eat" (2 Thess. iii. 10), but shall infants be starved because they can not work? If it is required in the Scriptures "not to forsake the assembling of ourselves together" (Heb. x. 25), does, therefore, the brother who is prevented by sickness, or other cause, from going to the house of the Lord, sin against this command? Well, the Scriptures require repentance and faith in order to baptism. But of whom do they require these? The answer plainly is, they require repentance and faith only of those who are capable of exercising them, just as the law of circumcision required "the keeping of the whole law" of him who was capable of doing it, and still circumcised the infant. Now, the logic (?) of our opponents is on this wise: "The Scriptures

require faith and repentance in order to baptism ; but infants have not faith and repentance ; therefore, they are not to be baptized." The sophistry in this is manifest. The Scriptures require faith and repentance only of adults, just as they required obedience to the law only of adults in order to circumcision. Now, a universal rule of logic is this : "There must never be more in the conclusion than there is in the premises from which it is drawn ;" and the reason assigned for this is self-evident. "Because," say the authorities, "the conclusion is to be drawn from the premises."

The logic of our opponents on this subject stands thus, when thrown into syllogistic form : The Scriptures require faith and repentance of adults in order to baptism ; but infants can not have these ; therefore, infants are not proper subjects of baptism. Thus, we have adults in the major premise, and infants in the conclusion. This, as all must see, sets at defiance all the recognized rules of reasoning. But to this the theory of our opponents must come in every attempt to combat the facts of this case. Having now disposed of the usual fallacies which characterize the objections to infant baptism, we will resume the argument.

In the commission, Matt. xxviii. 20, Christ said to the Apostles : "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Let us

now examine some of the things which Jesus had "commanded" his Apostles with reference to infants and his kingdom, which "things" they in turn were to "teach" to those proselyted to Christ.

In Matt. xix. 14 an opportunity was furnished for the Savior to announce the relation of infants to his kingdom. He said: "Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." The Savior made this declaration to define the relation of infants to his kingdom, and thus assign the reason why they should not be kept from him. Their relation is that of subjects; they are citizens in his kingdom, and as such they stand in a saved relation to him, alike with a regenerated adult. When adults are "born again," and made recipients of all the blessings of atoning love, their relation to Christ is expressed by, and comprehended in, the statement, "Now, therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God." (Eph. ii. 19.)

Such is also the statement with reference to infants — "Of such is the kingdom of heaven." Now, Christ had commanded these Apostles to let "little children come to him," and in the commission he tells them to teach all things whatsoever he had commanded them, including necessarily the bringing of little children to him. This can not mean anything but the re-

cognizing of their covenant relation to Christ, and the giving to them the token—baptism—of that relation.

Again: Luke ix. 47, 48: Jesus “took a child, and set him by him, and said unto them, Whosoever shall receive this child in my name, receiveth me.” Mark ix. 36, says Jesus “took him in his arms,” showing that it was an infant child. Now, what does Jesus here command with reference to this child? It is, that his people shall receive it in his name. This must imply the recognition of the fact that the child is Christ’s subject, and treat him accordingly. But would that be a recognition of this fact, which frowningly ignores that the child is a subject of Christ’s kingdom, and forcibly withholds from it the badge—baptism—of citizenship? Verily not. In these passages two things are made manifest:

(1) In Matt. xix. 14, the rights of infants are asserted—“Of such is the kingdom of heaven.” They are citizens—subjects.

(2) In Luke ix. 48, the duty of the Church with reference to them is announced—receive them in the name of Jesus Christ. This implies, beyond doubt, their baptism.

Men educated as we have seen these Apostles were, with infant baptism and infant membership in the Church prevalent from one limit of Israel to the other,

could not have misunderstood such declarations as these. Hence their practice in baptizing families, and hence the fathers, again and again, refer to the Apostles as authority for infant baptism.

With these facts before us, we have no hesitation in affirming that if anything is made obligatory upon us by the law of Christ's kingdom—by direct command—it is the baptism of infants. The right of pious women at the Lord's table, though unquestionable, has not half the testimony in its favor that infant baptism has. Their rights in "the kingdom of God" are clearly defined (Matt. xix. 14)—they are citizens; the duty of the Church in reference to them is explicitly stated (Luke ix. 48)—receive them in the name of Jesus; and the commission to disciple and baptize "the nations" (Matt. xxviii. 19) brings the positive command to baptize them. It is a fearful thing to stand up in the face of God's will, as thus plainly declared, and repudiate their rights in "the kingdom of heaven."

## ARTICLE VI.

## THE ORGANIC LAW OF GOD'S KINGDOM—ABRAHAMIC COVENANT—INFANTS PROVIDED FOR.

An appeal to constitutional provisions is always ultimate and decisive in matters in dispute. If the rights of my child as a member of the Commonwealth of Kentucky should be contested, I have only to appeal to the Constitution of the State—the organic law of the Commonwealth—and determine, by its decisions, the questions at issue. Equally true is it in the "Commonwealth of Israel." It has its organic law—a Constitution broad as the purposes of God in redemption, and as enduring as time. Its provisions are plainly written, and were illustrated by centuries of divine and inspired administration. To it we confidently appeal. We propose here to establish that the covenant which God made with Abraham is the universal covenant of grace, and that it makes special provision for infants. We thus state in advance our purpose, that the reader may follow intelligently. If, now, we establish, that this covenant is the great constitutional law of the Church, that it is never to be abrogated, and that it provides for the admission of infants into the Church, and that they shall have the

token of that covenant and Church relation, we shall have established the rightfulness of infant baptism by an appeal to an unalterable constitutional provision.

It may be necessary at this point, before entering more fully upon the examination of this divine constitution, to advert to some matters which our opponents seem to think are insuperable obstacles in the way of our argument upon the covenant. They affirm that that covenant was *local* and *temporary*, that it had exclusive reference to the lineal descendants of Abraham, and that it contemplated no higher good than the possession of Canaan and secular prosperity. Hence, they are fond of denominating both the covenant itself and everything appertaining to it as a “fleshy institution.” Now, we are free to admit that *some* of its provisions were *local* and *temporary*. But it can not be ignored that its great central features were *spiritual*, *universal*, and *eternal*. Let us illustrate our position here. On the 15th of June, 1215, the barons of England extorted from John, at Runnymede, the *Magna Charta Libertatum*. Many of its provisions were *local* and *temporary*—they passed away when the special want had been met for which they were framed. Such were the “checks upon the forest laws, feudal tenures,” &c. But not so with the 39th article of *Magna Charta*. It reads: “Let no freeman be imprisoned, or disseized, or outlawed, or in any manner injured or

proceeded against by us, otherwise than by the legal judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land. We shall sell, delay, or deny right or justice to none." Here were the "writ of *habeas corpus*," and "trial by jury." While other provisions of that *Charta* met the special wants for which they were framed and then fell into desuetude, this article has survived the lapse of centuries, the changes of administration, and the tread of revolutions. The thrones of Charles I. and James I. crumbled into irretrievable ruin ; new names have appeared upon the rolls of royalty ; new laws, customs, &c., have come and gone in the history of England, yet that 39th article of *Magna Charta* has survived the wreck and changes of these centuries, and will hold on in its supremacy as long as English liberty shall be prized, either in the old or new world.

So with the covenant which God made with Abraham. It contained items *local* and *temporary*, such as the "possession of the land of Canaan," a "numerous posterity," &c., &c. These provisions were realized in the millions of Hebrews, Ishmaelites, and others who descended from Abraham ; in a fifteen years' residence in the promised land, &c., and then these provisions passed away. But the great central features of this compact were "confirmed in Christ," and established as the Constitution of God's kingdom or Church forever. We propose in the following dis-

cussion to make this truth perfectly obvious. To this end we affirm: (1) *That the covenant made with Abraham is UNIVERSAL in its bearings and benefits.* This can not be said of any other covenant which God ever made with man. *E. g.*—The *covenant of works* made with Adam ceased when he fell; the *covenant of safety* with Noah extended not to the antediluvians, and can not be said, in any proper sense, to affect us; the *covenant at Sinai* lasted only 1481 years, and ceased upon the coming of the Messiah; and the *covenant of royalty* with David fell with his house. This exhausts the Bible covenants, and shows that of none but that of Abraham could it be affirmed that they were *universal* in their bearing and benefits. Let us, therefore, examine the evidences for the universality of the benefits of the Abrahamic covenant. Gal. iii. 16. “Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many, *but as of one*, and to thy seed, *which is Christ.*” I admire Tyndale’s translation of this and the following verse, made in 1534, more than any I have seen, and will give it in the quaint orthography of that period: “To Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He seyth not, *in the seeds*, as in many; but in *thy sede*, as in one, which is Christ. This I saye, that the laws which beganne afterwards, beyord *iiii. c. and xxx. yeare* [430 years] doth not disannul the testament that

was conferred afore of God unto Christward, to make the promes of none effect." Now, let the following items in this statement of the Apostle be examined, which show the spirituality and universality of this covenant: "*Not to seeds as of many;*" *i. e.*, this covenant was not made simply with reference to Abraham's natural progeny, such as Isaac, Jacob, &c.; but it was with reference to *Christ*, through whom "all the nations of the earth" were to be "blessed." Hence it was made with reference to "thy seed, which is Christ." Therefore, the covenant could no more be *local* and *temporary* than Christ, as an atonement for sin, could be *local* and *temporary*. That he was not such is affirmed in every declaration of Scripture concerning him. He "loved the world," and is "as a lamb slain from the foundation of the world." This covenant with Abraham, therefore, is as really *universal in its bearings and benefits* as is the atoning death of Christ in whom it was confirmed, and concerning whom it was made. No provision of it, consequently, can ever cease to be in force while Christ is a Savior. Strike from its place as the Constitution of God's Church this covenant and you rend away the last beam in the edifice of human salvation.

We proceed to notice (II): *That this covenant is unalterable—it can never be changed or abrogated.*

A little reflection will make this manifest. The

Apostle argues the truth of it from the *nature of covenants* in general. He says: "Though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be *confirmed*, no man disannuleth or addeth thereto." (Gal. iii. 15.) The illustration is as follows: *None but the parties* to a covenant can change or annul it when it has been confirmed or ratified. Either of the parties may make covenants with *other parties* afterward, but they can insert no provision which would annul or weaken any item in the covenant already ratified. Now, in this Abrahamic covenant God was one of the parties and Abraham the other. They *never* came together as covenanting parties after this covenant was ratified. "Four hundred and thirty years" afterward God and Moses came together as covenanting parties at Sinai, but Abraham, one of the parties to the former covenant, was absent, hence no clause could be inserted in the Sinaitic covenant which would clash with that made with Abraham. Hence, says the Apostle: "And this I say, that the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, [*i. e.*, the Abrahamic] the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, *can not disannul*, that it should make the promise of none effect." (Gal. iii. 17.) The facts, then, concerning these covenants are simply as follows: The one made with Abraham was 1911 years before Christ was born; 430 years after *that* covenant was ratified,

*i. e.*, 1481 years before Christ was born, God made a covenant with Moses at Sinai concerning the temporal affairs of the Hebrews; no transaction in this covenant could possibly set aside any provision in that made with Abraham without a flagrant disregard of the very nature of a covenant; hence these two covenants ran along side by side for 1481 years, when the Sinaitic expired by limitation, and the Abrahamic swept out over all nations, and over all time, holding Jesus Christ as its central figure. Hence the great truth is established, that *no* transactions made with Moses or any one else, after this covenant with Abraham was ratified, could set aside *any* provision of that covenant. I beg leave to submit here a most remarkable concession upon this point, made by the most distinguished opponent of infant baptism this country ever had. I mean Alexander Campbell. It is most manifest that in the following statement he was so hot in pursuit of a *Few* that he forgot infant baptism, else he never would have written these lines. He is commenting upon Gal. iii. He says: 1. "In the covenant with Abraham, which was solemnly ratified, God had promised *salvation to the Gentiles, before the nation of Israel existed, or the national covenant was instituted.* From this fact Paul argues that the Gentiles should not hearken to the Judaisers; that they should not practice any of the Jewish peculiarities.

The gospel which he now proclaimed to the Gentiles was substantially announced to Abraham when first called.

“2. But after expatiating upon this fact and confirming it with other considerations, the Apostle finds his argument upon the nature of covenants in general among men, and from one promise made to Abraham. It is notorious that when a covenant between two parties is ratified, no person, except the parties themselves, can disannul it. Now, God, one of the parties in the covenant, made the promises to Abraham and the seed of Abraham. This seed was a unity; not all the descendants of Abraham, but one of them, namely, the Messiah. *This covenant, then, was ratified with Abraham concerning the Messiah and unalterably settled.*

“3. Consequently, the law, or covenant with the whole nation of Israel, 430 years after this time, could not disannul the promise in another covenant, concerning persons not present, and, therefore, no party in that covenant.

“4. Here the Jew is introduced with his objection. ‘To what purpose, then, was the law?’ Paul shows that it was introduced for another purpose than to bestow or secure the inheritance promised 430 before it was promulgated; and, from the circumstances of its promulgation, completes his argument not yet brought

to a legitimate close. This law, or covenant, was, says he, introduced by angels, through the hands of a mediator, and could not affect the promises of the covenant with Abraham, for this plain reason, that the parties to that covenant, 430 years ratified, were not present. And the covenant at Sinai was ordained in the hands of a mediator, namely, Moses. There was no mediator between God and Abraham, *which proves the superiority of that covenant to the Sinaitic.* But the stress rests upon this fact, that this Moses, this mediator, was not one of the parties of that covenant concerning the seed. God, it is true, was one of them; but the covenant could not be disannulled, 'though it were but a man's,' unless both the parties were present. . . . But God was one of the parties, and might make with the fleshly seed of Abraham, by means of a mediator, any covenant he pleased, *which would not countervail any item in the former.* But as he was one party, he could not insert one clause in the Sinaitic covenant which would clash with that already ratified; so could not by any promise, or after act, exclude the nations of the earth from *participating in the blessings of the promised seed.*" (Appendix to N. T. of 1828, p. 435.) Thus it is acknowledged that the covenant with Abraham is the universal covenant of grace, that *no* subsequent legislation or covenant could annul *one* item contained in it; and hence, it can never be abrogated.

I will simply add, that this covenant alone, of all the covenants made, was ratified or confirmed *in Christ*. (Gal. iii. 17.)

We have, therefore, in this, the *Magna Charta* of the Church—the Constitution of God's kingdom. It can never be annulled while the promise of salvation through Christ is made to humanity; “no item” of it, says Mr. Campbell, can be annulled by *any* subsequent covenant.

Now, suppose that we appeal to this divine Constitution to ascertain the rights of infants in the Church of God. We turn to Genesis xvii. 1-14, where this covenant is recorded, and we find that infants at the tenderest age were to be brought to God and the token of the covenant given to them. When was this law of the covenant abrogated? We answer, *Never*. Is that covenant in force *to-day* as truly as when made with Abraham? We have seen that it is, and that even A. Campbell declared as much. If, then, that covenant is *now* in full force, and if this law of it with reference to infants has never been annulled, as we have seen it *has not*, and *could not* be, then does the unalterable Constitution of God's Church as imperatively demand that infants be brought into his Church now, and the token thereof given to them, as it did in the days of Abraham. There is no escape from this. Our opponents feel the crushing force of it, and fly to ridiculous cavils. We will notice them in due time.

Here we plant our banner. Here is the Constitution of God's Church. Here is fundamental, primordial, law for infant baptism and Church membership. Let our opponents show when this was repealed, or how in the nature of the case *it could* be repealed; and if they fail to do so, then let them cease their war upon God's appointment.

The intelligent opponents of infant baptism never fail to exhibit the utmost alarm at this point, and they have accordingly tortured themselves in the effort to bring forward something to break the force of this argument. We shall here examine their cavils—better than that we can not characterize them. (1.) It is objected by them that the appointment of circumcision, and consequently infant church-membership (Gen. xvii.) was in the year of the world 2107; and that the covenant concerning the Messiah (Gen. xxii.) was in the year 2141; that, consequently, this “covenant of circumcision,” as they express it, was separated from that covenant which was “confirmed in Christ” by about thirty-four years, and was, therefore, no part of it. This is a mere cavil, and one of comparatively recent origin. It has no foundation in fact. The covenant with Abraham is a development. It was not made as a whole at any one time or place. It began when God called Abraham from Ur of the Chaldees (Gen. xi.), was resumed upon the separation of

Abraham and Lot (Gen. xiii.), was again taken up in Gen. xvii., and was then broken off until the events narrated in Gen. xvii, and was resumed and completed at the offering of Isaac. (Gen. xxii.) It is the sheerest caviling imaginable to take these several stages in the development of this covenant, and out of them attempt to carve three or four covenants. A Rabbi in Campbellism, and perhaps one of the most scholarly men they have (President Milligan), virtually ignores this *dodge* of his brethren. He says: "In Gen. xvii. 2, 4, 7, the word *covenant* has reference to both the families of Abraham, and it is simply equivalent to the twofold and somewhat amplified *promise that God had made to him before he left Ur of Chaldee.*" (Scheme of Redemption, p. 76.) On page 79 he speaks of the Abrahamic covenant as a development from the call of Abraham in Ur. When their own positions are thus destroyed by their own friends we need not pause to argue against them. You have only to read one opponent of infant baptism against another when on this question. There has never been any union among them on this question, except in their unreasoning opposition. We confidently affirm, in view of the above facts, that the Abrahamic covenant, as recorded from Gen. xii. to xxii., is one.

Again (2.): It is objected that God had promised by Jeremiah (xxxii. 31-35) that he would "make a new

covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah," and that St. Paul reiterates the same promise (Heb. viii. 8), and then it is assumed that this is a covenant which is to take the place of that made with Abraham. Now, we have clearly seen that the covenant with Abraham could not be "disannulled" without a flagrant disregard of the nature of a covenant, and that Mr. Campbell so argues. Yet our opponents, in their desperation, seize upon such radically erroneous assumptions in the face of the teachings of their own brother Campbell, not to mention the Apostle Paul. This is done because they think some popular effect in their favor can be made out of the expressions, "new covenant," &c. We will meet them here. And (1) if it could be shown that God intended a "new covenant" by what is said Jer. xxxi. 31, and Heb. viii. 8, it has already been demonstrated that though a thousand "new covenants" might have been made after that with Abraham, still the very nature of covenants would forbid either the insertion of one item which would have clashed with any provision in that ratified with Abraham, or the annulling by the "new covenant" of any stipulation in the Abrahamic. For the parties not being present, the Abrahamic covenant was forever beyond the possibility of change or amendment. We might admit, therefore, all our opponents say about "a new covenant," and it *can not*

affect our position. Until they show where God and Abraham came together and "annulled" infant church-membership or anything else in that covenant, it can not be made to appear that any subsequent covenant, with entirely different parties, effected this. To talk, therefore, of "new covenants" as they do is simply to delude themselves and those who follow their teachings.

But (2) our opponents use the expressions, "*old covenant*" and "*new covenant*," as found in Jer. xxxi. and Heb. viii., in an utterly contradictory sense to that in which these inspired writers use them. Thus, our opponents mean by "*old covenant*" the Abrahamic covenant; and by "*new covenant*" they mean the covenant of salvation which was confirmed in Christ. Now, the simple truth is, that by "*old covenant*," which was "to vanish away," the Apostle means the *Sinaitic* covenant, as any one can see by reading the eighth and ninth chapters of Hebrews. There the "*first covenant*" and the "*old*" covenant are one and the same, and there designated that covenant which had a worldly sanctuary—"the tabernacle," "the candlestick," "the table" and "shew bread," "the holy of holies," the "golden censer," and whatever else pertained to the Levitical ritual given at Sinai. This is called by Paul "*the old*" covenant. The "*new covenant*," as used by Paul and Jeremiah,

is the *Abrahamic* covenant, which was confirmed in Christ, and is called the “*new covenant*” because it was never to become *antiquated* like the Sinaitic. Now, when writing upon *other* topics, our opponents themselves have admitted all this, and thus destroyed with their own hands their arguments upon the “*new covenant*.”

I quote on this head from Mr. Campbell’s Appendix to his translation of the New Testament, 1828, page 432. He says: “The term *new* is added to distinguish it from the *old covenant, that is, the dispensation of Moses*. . . . The *two covenants* are always in Scripture the two dispensations or religious institutions; *that under Moses is the old*.” Also, Milligan’s *Scheme of Redemption*, p. 75. “This [the Abrahamic covenant] is the same which is also *frequently called the new covenant*, and which is fully developed in the New Testament.” Thus out of their own mouth we condemn their position. Milligan and Campbell affirm that the “*new covenant*” is the Abrahamic covenant, and consequently not a different covenant which “*disannuls*” it, and that the “*old covenant*” is the Sinaitic, made 430 years after that with Abraham. Nothing need be added. I will simply say, in concluding this matter, that the expression, “*I will make a new covenant*,” in Heb. viii. 8, does not mean to *make new, de novo, or to originate*. It simply means

to *complete*. The Greek word is *συντελεσω*—*sunteleso*, which Campbell translates in *that verse* thus: “*I will complete a new institution with the house of Israel*,” &c. It is also defined by the best lexicons. The meaning simply is, that the promise of a redeeming Messiah, made in the covenant with Abraham, should be *completed*, or *fulfilled*, by the coming of his Son Jesus Christ. Thus their cavils melt and disappear, and we are left with the broad, eternal Constitution of God’s Church—the covenant with Abraham—providing for infant membership in the Church, which necessarily involves their baptism.

We might safely leave the whole matter here, demanding of our opponents to show when this law was abrogated—when this Constitution was so amended or changed as to exclude infants from the privileges of the Church. The *onus probandi* here turns upon them. But we shall proceed to show that the Church founded upon this divine Constitution never failed to recognize the eligibility of infants to the privileges of the Church.

## ARTICLE VII.

BAPTISM IN THE ROOM OF CIRCUMCISION—ST. PETER DECLARES THE CONTINUED ELIGIBILITY OF CHILDREN—UNITY AND CONTINUANCE OF THE CHURCH.

There are two points in connection with the argument from the covenant of grace, developed in our last, which we will notice:

(1.) Circumcision, which, under the former economy, was the rite of initiation into the Church, and the token of the covenant, is, under the present economy, substituted by baptism.

Let the facts already established be remembered, and it will be seen that the above statement is of itself conclusive in proof of infant baptism. We have already shown that that covenant, which is universal, eternal, unalterable—the Constitution of the Church to-day—provides for the admission of infants at the tenderest age. According to it, the Church for centuries received infants as members. Now, suppose it can be established that baptism takes the place in this covenant which circumcision formerly occupied, with no change of subjects specified. Will not that demand infant baptism as infallibly as infant circumcision was demanded before this change in the rite? We would

observe here, that to substitute baptism for circumcision would be no violation of covenant rights. It is very evident that among other offices of circumcision in the Church, it had a typical reference to the promised "Seed"—Christ, and, consequently, his coming was the limit of the continuance of that rite. Accordingly, the Apostles desisted unanimously from the practice of it. (Acts xv.) In its relation to church membership it was simply "the token" of the covenant, and, consequently, it was legitimate at any time to displace it by the appointment of another "token," and still the great covenant law not be affected.

It is not a little remarkable that the same change in the outward form of both sacraments in the Church did take place. For example, under the former economy, the sacrament relating to atonement—namely, the Passover, had as its outward form the paschal lamb, unleavened bread, bitter herbs and wine (which latter was introduced at some unknown time.) Now, when this sacrament of atonement was adjusted to the present economy, the Saviour threw off the lamb and the bitter herbs, and took the remaining items—namely, bread and wine, and under these forms perpetuated the sacrament of atonement. This change in the outward form did not affect the great law of atonement.

In like manner, the sacrament relating to Church membership—namely, circumcision, had as its outward

form a prescribed cutting in the flesh, and, as has been abundantly proven in a former number, baptism, though, like the “wine” in the Passover, the time of its introduction is not definitely known. When this sacrament relating to Church membership was adjusted to the present economy, the Savior threw off the cutting in the flesh, and took the remaining item—namely, baptism, and under this form perpetuated this sacrament, without affecting the covenant law. In the light of these truths, St. Paul’s language (Gal. iii. 27-28), becomes luminous. As has already been shown, when a Gentile family was proselyted under the former economy, the males were circumcised and baptized, and the females were baptized. Alluding to that readjustment of this sacrament which now makes the form of it practicable for all, he says, “For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.” Christ has so adjusted the elements of this sacrament under the present economy as to make it alike applicable to all.

Now, nothing can be plainer than that St. Paul alludes to this change of baptism for circumcision in Col. ii. 10-12, “And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power; in whom also

ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; buried with him in baptism," &c. Here it is manifest that circumcision and baptism are used interchangeably, and baptism is referred to as Christian circumcision.

The early writers in the Church thought and wrote conformably to this opinion. Thus, Justin Martyr: "And we, who have approached God through Him, have received not carnal, but spiritual circumcision, which Enoch and those like him observed. And we have received it through baptism, since we were sinners, by God's mercy; and all men may equally obtain it." (Dialogue with Trypho., chap. xliii.) Chrysostom says: "There was pain and trouble in the practice of Jewish circumcision; but our circumcision, I mean the grace of baptism, gives cure without pain; and this is for infants as well as men." We need not multiply quotations here. It is plain that the Church from the earliest times believed that baptism is in the room of circumcision.

These facts established, and the friends of infant baptism need not travel an inch further in the argument. Here is the Constitution of the Church providing for infant Church membership. For 1911 years the Church received infants, upon this Constitution, and gave them the initiatory rite and token—circum-

## INFANT BAPTISM.

cision. That Constitution remains as the fundamental law of the Church to-day, and the circumcision which, according to its provisions, was given to infants during nineteen hundred years, is now substituted by baptism. The conclusion is irresistible.

(2.) The second point to be noticed is the statement of the Apostle Peter with reference to the continuation of these covenant privileges to children. On the memorable day of Pentecost, Peter was addressing a multitude of Jews (Acts ii. 5), who had been educated to receive infants into the Church and give to them the token of covenant relation. In the course of his address to them he said: "For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." (V. 39.) Let us now examine this statement a little. The phrase, "to you and to your children," means adults and infants. This is indisputable. The word *teknois*—children—means, it is true, posterity, but it means infant as well as adult posterity, and is often restricted in its sense to infants. The phraseology here agrees exactly with that in Gen. xvii. 7, "to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee." While "thy seed" was a phrase by which the whole posterity of Abraham was expressed, it also narrowed itself down so absolutely to infancy that it enjoined circumcision upon the child eight days old. Let the same-

ness of the phraseology be considered. When God makes the covenant with Abraham by which infants are brought into the Church, the promise that he makes is "to thee, and to thy seed." When Peter at Pentecost, the very time when it is assumed that this covenant and all things appertaining to it was forever abrogated, stood up to proclaim the kingdom of Christ to the Jews, he said, "the promise is unto you, and to your children." When God said, "to thee, and to thy seed," the Church understood that infants were included, and for nineteen centuries she received them. What else could it mean, then, to Jews, when Peter, in the exact language of the covenant, said, "to you, and to your children?" Now, in both instances (Gen. xvii. 7, and Acts ii. 39) this phrase stands connected with an ordinance by which persons were to be admitted into the Church. When "to thee, and to thy seed," was said to Abraham (Gen. xvii. 7), it stood connected with circumcision; when "unto you, and to your children," was said by Peter, it stood connected with baptism. This language to Abraham, in connection with "the promise," brought infants into the Church for nineteen hundred years. The same language is now uttered in connection with "the promise" by an inspired Apostle. How would a congregation of Hebrews, such as that he addressed, understand it? There could be but one meaning, and that

is, that infants are placed in the same relation to baptism under the present economy, that they sustained to circumcision under the former economy. In both instances (Gen. xvii. 7, and Acts ii. 29), parents and children are united in the same way. There it is, "to thee, and to thy seed;" here it is, "to you, and to your children." The promise in both instances is connected with the initiatory rite into the Church—circumcision, baptism. In both instances the ordinance is made to result from the promise—the one is set down as a reason for the other (Gen. xvii. 9), "Thou shalt keep my covenant, therefore, thou and thy seed after thee;" that is, because God had given a promise. So, in Acts ii. 38-39, "Repent and be baptized every one of you . . . for [because] the promise is unto you, and to your children." Children are, therefore, placed in the same relation to both these ordinances. From these facts I deduce the following principle: When a positive institute is connected with a promise, all who are contained in the promise have a right to the institute. In Gen. xvii. a positive institute—circumcision—is connected with a promise, "to be a God to thee, and to thy seed." All mentioned in that promise were entitled to the institute circumcision. The Church so understood it for nineteen hundred years. In Acts ii. 38-39 a positive institute—baptism—is connected with a "promise,"

and children are named in that promise. Therefore, they have a right to baptism. Let our opponents disprove it if they can. Let it be remembered that both Peter and his audience had been educated in the belief of these truths, had themselves been brought into the Church in infancy, and no one can reasonably doubt that both the speaker and his hearers understood that infants were to continue in the same relation to the Church and baptism that they had formerly occupied to the Church and circumcision.

These points being established, we shall now proceed to demonstrate the fact, that the Church founded upon this covenant, and into which infants were admitted by the rite of circumcision, continues to this day as "the commonwealth of Israel," "the body of Christ." The opponents of infant baptism know of but one method of escape from the logic of this fact ; and that is, by one remorseless blow, to sweep from the four thousand years preceding Christ's nativity every thing that has the semblance of a Church. Their entire theory goes upon the assumption that during four thousand years the infinitely wise God was experimenting upon the awful question of salvation. Immortal souls by the million were appearing upon the stage, and then gliding into eternity ; hell was "enlarging" itself ; heaven hung black with the storms of wrath, portending the doom of sin ; along the fun-

eral column of humanity, which, amid the blackness of darkness, was melting away and disappearing at the mouth of the grave continually, the anxious inquiries rolled from age to age, "If a man die, shall he live again?" "What shall I do to be saved?" And still He who sees the end from the beginning was experimenting—setting up one economy and tearing down another—and never reached the right thing, until, on the day of Pentecost, four thousand years after humanity began its march to the grave! In all those sad centuries our opponents can see no Church for fostering piety, no Christ for the remission of sin. Elder Wilkes says: "It is not reasonable that there could be remission of sins before the shedding of that blood on which alone remission of sins depends. The shedding of Christ's blood is for the remission of sins, and that blood takes its effect after its shedding, not before. . . . I told you that there was no final remission of sins under the Jewish economy." (Wilkes-Ditzler Debate, pp. 59-60.) All this is necessary to get rid of infant baptism; for whenever it is made to appear that God's Church did, according to the provisions of its unalterable Constitution, receive infants then, and gave to them the initiatory rite, and that that Church, resting upon the same Constitution, is the Church of God to-day, infant baptism follows as an inevitable consequence. Hence the anxiety, and

even desperation, of our opponents to get rid of these facts. We shall proceed to establish them.

Our first work will be to show that the Church of God did then exist, as really and truly as it now exists. Not that there was a "fleshly institution," in which "neither faith nor piety was contemplated." (A. Campbell, debate with Rice, p. 309); but that a Church, having every essential fact and feature that the Church of Christ now possesses, did then exist.

Then (1), there was a Church centuries before "the day of Pentecost." Let us establish this fact, and then proceed to show its Christian character. Acts vii. 37-38: "This is that Moses, which said unto the children of Israel, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear. This is he, that was in the Church in the wilderness, with the angel which spake to him in the Mount Sinai, and with our fathers; who received the lively oracles to give unto us." Here, then, was the Church, in the days of Moses, who is said to have been a member of it. The fact that there was a Church then can not be doubted, for inspiration declares it. The word rendered Church here is *εκκλησια* (*ekklesia*), which, though sometimes used for a promiscuous assembly (but when so used is indicated as having that sense by the accompanying circumstances), is the word almost always employed to signify God's

separated people. It occurs 115 times in the New Testament, and is translated "Church" 112 times out of 115. A few examples of its use will not be out of place. Matt. xvi. 18, "build my Church;" xviii. 17, "tell it to the Church." Acts xx. 28, "feed the Church of God." Rom. xvi. 16, "the Churches of Christ." 1st Cor. i. 2, "unto the Church of God." 2d Cor. i. 1, "unto the Church of God." Gal. i. 13, "persecuted the Church of God." Eph. v. 25, "Christ also loved the Church." 2d Thess. i. 4, "in the Churches of God." Thus this word is used through the whole New Testament to designate God's separated people—the Church of Christ. Thus it is used in the text we have quoted, Acts vii. 37-38. What Stephen, in Acts vii., called the Church (*ekklesia*), Paul, speaking of the same time and circumstances, calls a "house," Heb. iii. 5. "Whose [i. e., Christ's] house," says he, "are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end," Heb. iii. 6. This "Church," then, "in the wilderness," fifteen hundred years before "the Pentecost" of Acts ii., in which Moses was a member, Paul declares to be Christ's "house," which he thus explains: "Whose house are we" This "Church," therefore, was the "house" of Christ.

Having thus established the fact that there was a "Church" then, by all rules which are relied on to

prove that there is a Church now, let us proceed to examine its character, and ascertain if it had the essentials of a Church of Christ.

2. We affirm that Christ was with that Church, and known to its members. That he was with that Church is indubitable. That is made manifest by a text already cited, viz: Heb. iii. 5, 6, "And Moses verily was faithful in all his house as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after; but Christ as a Son over his own house; whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end." Let it be observed that St. Paul is, in this chapter, showing the superiority of Christ over Moses, and he makes the following points: (a.) Moses did not build the "house;" Christ did. (b.) Moses was only in the "house;" Christ was over it, as its ruler. (c.) Moses was a servant in this "house;" Christ was the Son and heir. This "house," therefore, which was "the Church" (Acts vii. 37, 38), which Moses was "in," had Christ "over" it as the ruler of "his own house."

But the fact that Christ was with this Church is made manifest by various other Scriptures, some of which we give:

1st Cor. x. 4. Speaking of the "fathers" who "passed through the sea" in coming out of Egypt, Paul says, "And did all drink the same spiritual drink;

for they drank of that Spiritual Rock that followed them; and that Rock was Christ." Christ was with them, and they knew him, and had intimate communion with him, expressed by "drinking of that Spiritual Rock." In verse 9, continuing the same subject, he says, "neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted." They "tempted Christ," as we do now when we murmur and disobey.

Heb. xi. 26. It is said of Moses, "Esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt." Moses, who was in that "Church" as a distinguished "servant," knew "Christ," and his "reproach," and chose him in preference to "the treasures in Egypt." The same fact presents itself in all subsequent ages of "the Church." Christ was with it, and known to the members of it. Thus, St. Peter (1st Peter i. 10, 11), "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you; searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow."

Again, Acts x. 43. "To him [Jesus Christ] give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Not only was he with "the Church," and known to

the members thereof, but “remission of sins” was declared, by every inspired teacher whom God raised up, to be through “faith in his name.” How little truth, therefore, is there in Mr. Campbell’s assertion, that in that Church “neither faith nor piety was contemplated!”

Here we have established the fact that there was a “Church,” and have seen that Christ, as the head, was with that Church and known to the members thereof. But one item remains—namely :

3. The Gospel was preached in that Church. To the proof of this we at once proceed: Heb. iii. 16-19, and iv. 1, 2: “For some, when they had heard, did provoke; howbeit, not all that came out of Egypt by Moses. But with whom was he grieved forty years? Was it not with them that had sinned, whose carcasses fell in the wilderness? And to whom sware he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that believed not? So we see they could not enter in because of unbelief. Let us therefore fear, lest a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it. For unto us was the Gospel preached, as well as unto them; but the word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it.”

Here it is declared that “the Gospel was preached” to those who were in this “Church in the wilderness,”

and that some then, as ever since, failed of its benefits through “unbelief;” “howbeit not all that came out of Egypt by Moses.” Many heard, believed, were saved by it, just as men here believe, and are saved by it now. The same Apostle declares that the Gospel was preached “to Abraham,” Gal. iii. 8, which the *Geneva* version of 1557 thus renders: “For the Scripture sawe afore hande, that God wolde justifie the Gentiles through faith, and therefore preached beforehand the Gospel unto Abraham,” &c.

Let us now sum up these facts. We have seen (1) That there was a Church fifteen centuries before the time at which our opponents say it was “set up.” (2) That Christ, “the head” and ruler, was with that Church, known to its members, who had communion with him, and dispensing “remission of sins through faith in his name.” Acts x. 43. (3) That the Gospel was preached in that Church, was rejected by some “who heard it,” and believed by others who were saved through it. Now, let me ask, what more have we to-day making up the Church of Christ? The Church as “the body,” Christ as “the head,” and the Gospel as the rule of faith and practice, each in their divinely appointed relation, the one to the other, is all that our opponents themselves claim as necessary to constitute “the Church of Christ.” This we had in “the wilderness,” fifteen hundred years before

he nativity, built upon the covenant with Abraham as its Constitution, and infants received into it at the tenderest age, and the initiatory rite thereof given to them! Our opponents claim that this Church, which they are pleased to call "a fleshly institution," was abolished, and "the Church of Christ" set up after the crucifixion. But if the Scriptures which we adduce depose correctly, why abolish "the Church of Christ" to set up "the Church of Christ?" Could anything more be done toward making it "the Church of Christ," when Christ was already with it as its head—known, loved and adored by its members, and his Gospel preached in it? Nothing could be more absurd than the position of our opponents here.

We close this number with a brief glance at the points of unity which have always existed, and must continue to exist, in the Church of God.

(1) "One body." 1st Cor. xii. 12, 13, "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles." "The body," which is the Church (Col. i. 17, 18), "is one" through all time and all economies, and the pious Hebrews, or "Jews," were in this "one body."

(2) One system of doctrine. We have only space to name these. We shall notice them more at length

hereafter. In the time of which Stephen speaks, Acts vii. and Paul, Heb. iii. and iv., "the Church" had the same doctrines it now has, according to the Scriptures, such as "Atonement," "Repentance," "Faith," "Pardon," "Resurrection," "Judgment," "Heaven," "Hell," &c., &c. In the very first sermon that Christ preached after his resurrection it is said, "And beginning at Moses, and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." Luke xxiv. 27.

Into this Church, we re-affirm, which had all the facts and essentials of the Church of Jesus Christ, infants were brought by the Constitution thereof. Let our opponents show when they were legislated out.

## ARTICLE VIII.

## UNITY OF THE CHURCH, AND OF INFANT MEMBERSHIP IN IT (CONTINUED).

It has been seen that in the time of Moses, and on afterward, there was a *Church*, possessing all the facts and elements which make up "the Church of God" to-day. Christ was with it. Its members knew him and had communion with him. Remission of sins was then, as now, through faith in his name. The Gospel was preached in it. And all the doctrines which the Church has now, it had then. That many of its members did, from time to time, become degenerate in life and doctrine is a sad fact; but it is a fact which also characterized the Church in the Apostolic age, and has been a blot upon her escutcheon in every age since. But who ever dreamed of arguing that God had no Church in the Apostolic age because profligacy of life and heresy in doctrine characterized the Church at Corinth, and at Laodicea, and in Galatia, and, in fact, almost everywhere to a greater or less extent? When a portion of the Church becomes faithless, apostatizes, it will not do to assume that all are like them. This would disprove the existence of

the Church to-day as well as a thousand years before the nativity. In fact, inspiration attempts to save us from such delusive assumptions. St. Paul takes up one of the most degenerate periods in the history of the Church before the birth of Jesus, and shows that even then there were those who remained faithful and pure amid an almost overwhelming apostasy : “ Wot ye not what the Scripture saith of Elias ? How he maketh intercession to God against Israel, saying, Lord, they have killed thy prophets, and digged down thine altars ; and I am left alone, and they seek my life. But what saith the answer of God unto him ? I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal. Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace.” (Rom. xi. 2-5.) Here was one of the darkest periods in the history of the Church. God’s altars were “ digged down,” his prophets were “ killed,” the dismal rites of Baal were observed on every mountain and in every vale ; even Elias supposed the apostasy was universal and complete. But even then “ seven thousand men ” (by which expression an indefinite but large number is intended), remained faithful and true. Paul surveys a similar scene in his own day. He saw defection and apostasy everywhere, yet did not conclude that, therefore, God’s Church had fallen and the covenant

failed; but, on the contrary, shows that then, as in the days of Elias, there was "a remnant" who remained true. There could, therefore, be no more fallacious process of argumentation than that of our opponents who assume that because the "rulers of the people" and multitudes of their creatures rejected Christ when he came, or were heretical and impure centuries before he came, therefore God had no Church then. "The rulers" and their minions did the same in the days of Elias, and still God had a true people left. Now, one of the great benefits of Messiah's coming was to be the cleansing and purifying of his Church from these evils. Thus saith the prophet: "And the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in; behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts. But who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner's fire, and like fuller's soap. And he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver; and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness. Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the Lord, as in the days of old, and as in former times." (Malachi iii. 1-4.) This prophet, standing upon the utmost verge of the old prophetic period, and looking across a chasm of

four hundred years, during which time no prophet should arise, sees the Messiah at the great work of purifying his Church from heresy and degeneracy, thus anticipating the glorious work which John the Baptist saw inaugurated when he said: "His fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." (Matt. iii. 12.) The Church, therefore, was not to be dismantled and a new experiment entered upon. But it was to be absterged and purified from erroneous doctrines and degenerate members. We ask the reader to turn to Matthew xxi. 33-46, and read it carefully in this connection. Under the parable of "the Vineyard" Christ fully sets forth the fact that his Church, which was often likened to a vineyard (see Isa. v.) was not to be torn down and a new institution erected because of the apostasy of so many of its members, but it was "to be taken from" those who had proved untrue to it—the apostate portion of Israel—and "given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." (V. 43.) The apostates who heard him did not misunderstand him on this point, for "when the Chief Priests and Pharisees had heard his parables, they perceived that he spake of them" (V. 45); "and when they heard it, they said, God forbid." (Luke xx. 16.)

St. Paul argues the same thing under a different

figure. In Roman xi. he likens the Church to "a good olive tree," from which some of the "branches" or members were broken off through "unbelief," and the Gentiles were "grafted in." "And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree; boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee." It is manifest that by this "good olive tree" he means the Church. This will be made plain. Bloomfield, on verse 17, says: "Of the olive tree, *i. e.*, of the promises to Abraham, and the privileges of God's Church." Moses Stuart, on verse 17, says: "The image which he here employs is a very vivid one. The Gentiles had been grafted in upon the Jewish Church, and had caused this decayed tree to revive and flourish." Tholuck, on the same verse, says: "By Christianity, he says, Judaism is not properly done away; that was rather the veil by which Christianity was once concealed. So little, then, ought the Gentile to look down upon the Jew, as the follower of a false religion, that he must rather regard him as one belonging to the true religion, but who does not appreciate that as he ought, and so is in error regarding his own faith. On the contrary, the Gentile, instructed in Christianity, becomes thereby a true Jew." It is needless to

multiply citations of this kind. The voice of learned criticism has not one discordant note at this point. All acknowledge that by "the good olive tree" the Church of God, as it existed among the Hebrews, is meant. This being established, observe the following points made by the Apostle:

(1) The unbelieving Jews, as fruitless branches, are "broken off" (V. 17); "some of the branches be broken off" (V. 20); "because of unbelief they were broken off;" for rejecting the Messiah and corrupting the faith. But this did not destroy "the good olive tree." Its "root and fatness" remained, and the Gentiles were grafted in among the branches which remained.

(2) That the Gentiles, when converted to Christianity, were "grafted into this good olive tree"—the Church—not formed into a new organization. Addressing these Gentile converts, St. Paul says: "If some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree; boast not against the branches." (V. 17.) This can not be misunderstood. The Church of God had remained, based upon the "everlasting covenant" made with Abraham; many Jews had been thrust out because of "unbelief" and unholiness of life; and those who were converted to Christ from among the Gentiles were brought into this Church.

(3) That when the Jews, now in unbelief, are reclaimed and brought to recognize the Messiah in Jesus of Nazareth, they will be restored to their original Church and covenant relation—not introduced into a new institution. So saith the Apostle, verse 23, “And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in; for God is able to graft them in again,” V. 24; “how much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree?” But let us suppose that the position of our opponents, with reference to the Church, be correct. Then, when the Jews are converted (as the Scriptures assuredly indicate they will be), and brought into the Church of God, instead of being returned to “their own olive tree,” or Church, they will find themselves in an organization utterly at variance with the Church from which they had been cut off. Our opponents say that the Church set up on Pentecost had “new principles;” that it rests upon a “new covenant”—a different Constitution—that it is radically different in its “terms of membership,” its “doctrines,” and its “members.” How would this be a restoration of the converted Israelite to his own olive tree. The absurdity of the position is most manifest. Here, then, as in many other places, the Apostle, in harmony with the Saviour’s teachings on the subject, declares the unity and continuance of the Church through all dispensations.

These facts being established, let us now return to the point from which we digressed. One of the great benefits of Messiah's coming, we have said, was to be the cleansing and purifying of this Church. Accordingly, before that ever memorable day of Pentecost, the Church, purged from the accumulated abuses of ages, and separated from the faithless multitude who had crowded her courts, appears all glorious. *Acts i. 15, 16.* "And in those days Peter stood up in the midst of the disciples, and said (the number of the names together were about an hundred and twenty), men and brethren, this Scripture must needs have been fulfilled," &c.

Here was the Church of God, called by one of its most common appellations—"disciples." Now, with reference to this Church, we observe the following facts :

(1) It performed, at this point in its history, one of the most solemn duties the Church was ever called upon to discharge—namely, to elect an Apostle. (Verses 16 and 26.) Surely if it had not been the Church of God it would not have presumed to do such a thing.

(2) To this Church the "three thousand" were "added" on the day of Pentecost, and the millions who were afterward converted to Christ. So we read, *Acts ii. 41*, "Then they that gladly received his word

were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." To whom, or to what, were these three thousand added? Most manifestly to that Church, which, as we have seen, a few days before, had elected an Apostle, whose number is stated to have been "an hundred and twenty," and which bore the common name of the Church—disciples. In the 47th verse these are called the Church—"And the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved." Instead, therefore, of finding a new organization set up on the day of Pentecost, we find the converts made on that day "added" to a previously existing and regularly constituted "Church."

(3) The "one hundred and twenty" who composed this Church never received Christian baptism on or after the day of Pentecost. They had been brought into the Church by circumcision in infancy, and had not gone off in the apostasy. They were, in part at least, "the remnant according to the election of grace," to which St. Paul refers in Romans xi. 5. This was the "good olive tree" from which the fruitless branches had been broken off, and into which the vast multitudes converted from among the Gentiles "were grafted."

Let not our opponents cavil at the smallness of the number of this Church as it appears in Acts i. 15-16. The eye of prophecy had looked down through many

centuries upon this little company, and the tongue of prophets had been divinely moved to utter “exceeding great and precious promises” to them. We will read some of those promises, and thereby still further see that it never was the intention of Jehovah to destroy the Church founded upon his covenant with Abraham, but, on the contrary, to bring the Gentiles to it. “But Zion said, The Lord hath forsaken me, and my Lord hath forgotten me. Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? Yea, they may forget, yet will I not forget thee. Behold, I have graven thee upon the palms of my hands; thy walls are continually before me. Thy children shall make haste; thy destroyers and they that make thee waste shall go forth of thee.” When the Church was so fearfully diminished by the apostasy, she is represented as exclaiming, “The Lord hath forsaken me, and my Lord hath forgotten me”—the very thing which our opponents say was done. But God says to his weeping Church, “Behold, I have graven thee upon the palms of my hands,” and assures her that even though a mother should forget her child, “yet I will not forget thee.” But how could he promise this if he intended to lay her utterly waste, and throw her aside as a “fleshly” thing which “contemplated neither faith nor piety!” But he proceeds to show her the en-

largement and glory which he would bring to her in the days of her desolation. "Lift up thine eyes round about, and behold; all these gather themselves together, and come to thee. As I live, saith the Lord, thou shalt surely clothe thee with them all, as with an ornament, and bind them on thee as a bride doeth." Here the promise is that the Gentiles shall come to Zion—the Church—and the desolation made by the apostasy of so many Jews shall be repaired by the ingathering of the nations. But the promise proceeds: "The children which thou shalt have, after thou hast lost the other [after the apostasy], shall say again in thine ears, The place is too strait for me; give place to me that I may dwell. Then shalt thou say in thine heart, Who hath begotten me these, seeing I have lost my children, and am desolate, a captive, and removing to and fro? and who hath brought up these? Behold I was left alone; these, where had they been? Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I will lift up mine hand to the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the people; and they shall bring thy sons in their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders. And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers; they shall bow down to thee with their faces toward the earth, and lick up the dust of thy feet; and thou shalt know that I am the Lord; for they shall not be ashamed that wait for me."

(Isa. xl ix.) Here was the assurance—not that the Church should be dismantled and obliterated because “the Chief Priests, and Scribes, and rulers of the people” rejected the Messiah and apostatized from the faith, but that the Church should arise from the pressure of these calamities and the woe of these desolations, and “clothe” herself with the nations of the earth. The history of the past eighteen hundred years has verified these promises. But the promise continues: “Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear; break forth into singing, and cry aloud, thou that didst not travail with child; for more are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife, saith the Lord. Enlarge the place of thy tent, and let them stretch forth the curtains of thine habitations; spare not, lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes; for thou shalt break forth on the right hand and on the left; and thy seed shall inherit the Gentiles, and make the desolate cities to be inhabited. . . . In a little wrath I hid my face from thee for a moment; but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy on thee, saith the Lord thy Redeemer.” (Isa. liv. 1, 3, 8.)

It is needless to copy more of these assurances of continuance and increase of the Church. They glitter like the stars of morning upon almost every page of prophecy. Instead, therefore, of abolishing his

Church, and setting up on the day of Pentecost "a new institution," with "new principles and new terms of membership," every promise that God had given the Church was to the effect that she should survive the apostasy, and pass on to "inherit the Gentiles," with her Constitution unchanged and her organization unbroken. Accordingly, we see the Church before the day of Pentecost (Acts i. 15-16) in the discharge of her high functions, and on that memorable day 3,000 were "added" to it, and 5,000 a few days after, and then she sweeps out over all tribal metes and bounds and gathers into her embrace the millions that are "beyond." Triumphing over the desolations of all ages, and passing unbroken over prostrate empires and crumbled thrones, she has come grandly down from the remotest antiquity. She was venerable with years when the pyramids of Egypt were begun; she was all glorious as the City of God when the foundations of Babylon were laid; the martial tread of her hosts was felt upon this earth before Sesostris shook the plains of Asia, or Xerxes stormed the defenses of Greece. As we stand in her venerable presence to-day, we may properly address to her the splendid lines of the poet :

" But thou of temples old, or altars new,  
Standest alone—with nothing like to thee—  
Worthiest of God, the holy and the true!  
Since Zion's desolation, when that He

Forsook his former City, what could be  
Of earthly structures in his honor pil'd  
Of a sublimer aspect? Majesty,  
Power, glory, strength, and beauty, all are aisl'd  
In this eternal ark of worship undefil'd."

If we look back now along the line of development we have pursued we shall see that the following facts have been established :

(1) The covenant made with Abraham, which in the very nature of the case is unalterable, and which "was confirmed in Christ," does, as the eternal Constitution of the Church, provide that infants shall be received into membership by the Church and the initiatory rite thereof given them. This is the Constitution of the Church to-day.

(2) That the initiatory rite, which under a former economy was circumcision, and was given to infants, has, under the present economy, been changed to baptism, with no change specified as to the subjects thereof. Hence the constitutional provisions with reference to children not being changed, their rights remain the same.

And (3) that the Church, founded upon this Constitution, and illustrating its meaning by her administration in receiving infants to membership for nearly two thousand years before the birth of Christ, continues to this day the same Church—the same in her

“ Head, which is Christ,” the same in her Constitution, in her doctrines, terms of membership, &c. From these facts, sustained at every point by the explicit declarations of God’s word, the conclusion comes as inevitably as the effect flows from its cause—infant baptism is authorized by the word of God.

The Scriptures by which our opponents attempt to disprove the unity of the Church in all ages, will be next considered.

## ARTICLE IX.

THE TEXTS SUPPOSED TO MILITATE AGAINST THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH, CONSIDERED (JER. XXXI. 31-34; HEB. VIII. 8-12; AMOS IX. 11; ACTS XV. 14, ETC.)

It has been supposed by our opponents that the above texts disprove the position that the Church and its Constitution have remained one and the same through all dispensations. Now, if there were a conflict between the above texts, on this question, and the numerous plain and unequivocal declarations of Scripture which we have produced to establish the unity of the Church, all the rules of Biblical interpretation would demand that these texts relied on by our opponents be interpreted in harmony with those we have adduced. Our position is sustained by plain declarations which appear all through the Bible; by processes of reasoning by inspired prophets and Apostles; by parables and illustrations by the Savior, until a demonstration is made which no separate and isolated text can displace without establishing a precedent which would lay the very heart of Christianity bare to the thrusts of infidelity.

But no such conflict exists here. These passages, relied on by our opponents, when calmly considered, fall into line and support our claim. Let us, therefore, take them up, one by one, and examine them.

Jer. xxxi. 31-34. This is quoted by St. Paul, Heb. viii. 8-12. Let the reader turn to them and read them carefully. In both these places the promise of "a new covenant" is given, and that the law of God should be "put in their inward parts, and written in their hearts."

From this our opponents attempt to show, that by "a new covenant" is meant one different from that made with Abraham—a new Constitution for a new Church. "He tells us not only that it will be a new covenant, but that it will be unlike the old covenant" (Wilkes in the W. D. Debate, p. 49); that the terms of membership under this new covenant are radically different from those of the old. Under the new, God's law is to be put in the inward part, and his law written in the heart. This, say our opponents, can not be done to infants, and that, consequently, they are no longer eligible to covenant relation. It ought to be a sufficient answer to all this to say that it contradicts all St. Paul says concerning the covenant with Abraham. Gal. iii. 15. It is there shown, as also in other places, that the covenant with Abraham could not be displaced by any subsequent arrangement, and that no

item of any new covenant could clash with the items of that without a palpable violation of all covenant rights. Once a covenant is ratified by the parties, it becomes unalterable in all subsequent time, except by the parties to it. God might make a covenant with any of the people of Israel at any time, and he might multiply these "new covenants" a thousandfold, but no one of them could contravene that made with Abraham and "confirmed in Christ."

Again: It is plain from the quotation above from Mr. Wilkes, and also from the statements of others in sympathy with him, that there is a continual confounding of the terms old and new with reference to these covenants. We have already shown, what is admitted by Mr. Campbell and President Milligan, that in these places the "old covenant" is that made with Moses at Sinai, and that the "new covenant" is the Abrahamic. But Mr. Wilkes and others make the "old" mean the Abrahamic covenant, and the "new" something which they imagine was inaugurated after the crucifixion. This is a miserable perversion, and lies at the foundation of all their fallacies on this point. Neither Jeremiah nor Paul contemplated such a thing in making "a new covenant" as that which our opponents assume. They assume that those inspired men meant to originate a covenant, to create that which had no previous existence. But a

moment's examination must convince the unprejudiced that they contemplated no such thing.

The Hebrew word used by Jeremiah, and translated "new" in our version, is *hhdash*, which Furst defines "to renew, to set up anew," and he refers, as examples of its use in this sense, to 1st Sam. xi. 14, "Then said Samuel to his people, Come, and let us go to Gilgal, and *renew* the kingdom there;" and 2d Chron. xv. 8, "And Asa . . . *renewed* the altar of the Lord that was before the porch of the Lord;" xxiv. 4, "And it came to pass after this, that Joash was minded to *repair* the house of the Lord;" Isa. lxi. 4, "And they shall *repair* the waste cities, the desolations of many generations."

Julius Bates (Critica Hebræa, of 1767,) also defines it "to renew," and cites the examples above given, with the addition of Ps. ciii. 5, "Thy youth is *renewed*." The word which Jeremiah employs does not, therefore, mean to originate in this passage. When the seventy rendered this word in Greek, they translated it by *διαθησομαι* (*diathesomai*), which is never defined by the lexicons in the sense of to originate, but "to dispose, arrange, settle mutually." (Liddell and Scott.) Or, as Robinson defines, "to appoint, to assign, to covenant" When St. Paul quotes this passage from Jeremiah (Heb. viii. 8), he uses, not the word which the Seventy used, but *συντελεσω* (*suntele-*

*leso*), which Robinson defines thus, “to finish wholly, to complete, to fulfill,” and refers to many examples of its use in the Scriptures in this sense. Now, a remark will be sufficient to show the bearing of all this. Under the accumulated rites and ceremonies of the Levitical ritual the spirituality of religion, and of the Church founded upon the covenant with Abraham, had been greatly lost sight of. God, therefore, points to the time, in this language of Jeremiah, when these rites and ceremonies of that ritual—the Sinaitic covenant—should be removed, and when the pure spirituality of the Church and of religion, as contemplated in the Abrahamic covenant, should be restored. Hence it is called a renewal, a restoration, a completion, of that begun with Abraham. It is not a little remarkable that all our old English translations render St. Paul’s language in Heb. viii. 8 in perfect accordance with this statement. I will here give them in parallel columns:

Wiclid—1380—Heb. viii. 8,  
“For he repremyng them: Seith, lo daies comer seith the lord; and I schal make perfect a newe testament on the hous of israel and on the hous of juda.”

Cranmer 1539 Heb. viii, 8,  
“For in rebukinge them, he sayth unto them, Behold the days come (sayth the Lord) and I will fynisshe upon the

Tyndale—1534—Heb. viii. 8, “For in rebukyng them he sayth, Behold the days will come (sayth the lorde) and I will fynnysh [finish] upon the housse of Israhel and upon the housse of Juda a newe testament.”

Rheims—1582—Heb. viii. 8,  
“For blaming them he saith: Behold the daies shal come, saith our Lord; and I will con-

house of Israel, and upon the house of Juda, a new testament.”

summate upon the house of Israel, and upon the house of Juda a new Testament.”

These venerable translators, following the real meaning of the words of Jeremiah and Paul, in every instance render them according to the definitions and use of them which we have shown. In fact, the idea of renewal or restoration pervades the entire 31st chapter of Jeremiah. Thus, verse 28th, “And it shall come to pass, that like as I have watched over them [*i. e.*, the house of Judah and of Israel, verse 27] to pluck up, and to break down, and to throw down, and to destroy, and to afflict; so will I watch over them, to build, and to plant, saith the Lord.”

Instead, therefore, of a new covenant and a new Church, in which conditions of membership should exist impossible for an infant to comply with, the language is a promise of a perfect renewal of that covenant which provides for infants, and of that Church which had always received them. God’s law was in the mind and written in the hearts of the faithful members of the Church centuries before the crucifixion, as really as at any time since. Thus the pious Psalmist exclaims, “Thy word have I hid in mine heart, that I might not sin against thee. . . . O how I love thy law; it is my meditation all the day . . . . for thy testimonies are my meditation. . . .

How sweet are thy words unto my taste ! yea, sweeter than honey to my mouth. . . . . Thy testimonies have I taken as an heritage forever ; for they are the rejoicing of my heart." (Ps. 119.) Has any one, under the present economy, a happier experience in the law of God than this ? David did not regard it impossible for adults to have the law of God written in their hearts in a Church which received infants. Why should we ? The reasonings of our opponents upon the texts under consideration is a tissue of sophistry from beginning to end.

As the idea of a "new Church," and a new order of things in it, is the point around which the opponents of infant baptism make their hottest and most determined fight, it may not be improper to elaborate a little further the Biblical idea of restoration or renovation with reference to the Church. The idea everywhere presented in the Bible on this subject is that God would, at the coming of the Messiah, relieve the Church of the numerous and oppressive rites which the Sinaitic covenant placed upon it, and restore to it the simple spiritual worship which it had before. We will take one prominent presentation of this idea as an illustration of the truth of this position :

The prophet Amos (ix. 11), referring to that much desired period, said: "In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the

breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old." A little consideration will disclose the fact, that by "the tabernacle of David," and the building of it "as in the days of old," is meant that renovation of the Church and restoration of a pure, comparatively non-ritual, worship which we have seen foretold by Jeremiah. To this end let us examine the several particulars of this prophecy in their proper order :

(1) The word "tabernacle" used by Amos means the Church, not the lineage or family of David, as some suppose. Whitby, perhaps, is more responsible than any other commentator for this error. As a distinguished critic (Dr. Smith) says: "Seeing the word 'tabernacle' in the English version, he (Whitby) hastily concluded that the usual word for 'tabernacle' in the original—namely, *mishkan*, was the word employed by Amos, without troubling himself to examine the Hebrew text of the prophet, to verify his conjecture. He has, consequently, misled his readers." (Harmony, p. 106.) Mr. Wilkes, ignorant of the Hebrew, submitted himself to the unsafe guidance of Whitby in this particular, and fell into the same egregious error. He said: "The tabernacle of David means the family of David, the lineage of David." (W. D. Debate, p. 61.) The word here rendered "tabernacle" is *sukkath*, which never is used to signify

a "house" in the sense of a "family." Furst defines this word, "A booth, hut, a tent," &c. Amos passed by the word (*mishkan*) which ordinarily means "family," and took this word *sukkath* to express, first, the house which David built for the worship of God, and, secondly, the spiritual, non-ritual worship which was offered there. The prophecy, therefore, declares the restoration of this Church.

(2) Let us now examine the history of the "tabernacle of David." The facts concerning it are briefly as follows: When the Hebrews crossed the Jordan, the tabernacle built in the wilderness was set up at Gilgal, and after the death of Joshua it was removed to Shiloh in the tribe of Ephraim. Here the Levitical ritual was observed in all the departments of worship. In the days of Eli's high-priesthood the Hebrews took the Ark of the Covenant from this tabernacle and carried it before them to a great battle with the Philistines, in which they were slaughtered and the Ark captured. It remained in Philistia seven months, and was then returned to the Israelites, but was never restored to the tabernacle at Shiloh—the Mosaic tabernacle. On its return from Philistia it was placed in the house of Abinadab, whose son Eleazar was "sanctified to keep the Ark of the Lord," and there it remained for eighty years. In the meantime the Mosaic tabernacle was removed from Shiloh to

Gibeon in the tribe of Benjamin. When, therefore, David came to the throne, the Ark was at the house of Abinadab in the tribe of Judah, and the tabernacle of Moses at Gibeon in the tribe of Benjamin. When David had subdued his enemies on every hand, his pious heart turned toward the Ark of the Lord which he determined to remove. He accordingly built a new tabernacle—*sukkath*—near his own house on Mount Zion for its reception. When he attempted to remove it thither the folly of Uzzah provoked the anger of God, who “smote him for his error, and there he died by the Ark of God.” This caused a delay in its removal, and it was left in the house of Obed-Edom for three months. At the end of that time David removed it, and amid great rejoicing placed it in the tabernacle which he had built on Mount Zion. There it remained about thirty years, until the third year of the reign of Solomon, who removed it to the temple which he built. Now, the use which we make of these facts is this: During all this time that the Ark of the Covenant was in the tabernacle on Mount Zion, the numerous services, sacrifices, etc., prescribed by the Levitical ritual were duly performed in the Mosaic tabernacle at Gibeon in the tribe of Benjamin, while David and the pious Hebrews of his day offered a simple spiritual worship to God in the tabernacle on Mount Zion. In the midst of that tabernacle the Ark

was placed. (21 Sam. vi. 17.) It was not veiled or concealed from the view of the people, as it had been in the tabernacle of Moses, and afterward was in the Holy of Holies in the temple. But, with its golden cherubim, and the glorious shekinah of God, it was placed in the sight of the worshipers who had immediate and free access to it. There a gloriously spiritual worship was offered. "And he appointed certain of the Levites to minister before the Ark of the Lord, and to record, and to thank, and praise the Lord God of Israel." (1st Chron. xvi. 4.) Mark this worship. It had ministers in the fullest sense of that term; and "to record," *i. e.*, to preach and teach; "to thank and praise the Lord God of Israel," *i. e.*, to celebrate the divine goodness in song. For this "service of song" David provided a large choir of singers, and the splendid Psalms of David, so rich in the experience of divine grace, so grand in their melody, and so subduing in their tenderness, composed the hymnology employed. Here was a pure spiritual worship, free from "bleeding bird and bleeding beast,"—"from hyssop branch and sprinkling priest." The attendants here were not simply the royal family, but "the great congregation" so often referred to. Holiness of life was essential to communion in that worship. Concerning the character that would be accepted there, David says: "Who shall ascend into the hill of the

Lord, or who shall stand in his holy place? He that hath clean hands and a pure heart; who hath not lifted up his soul unto vanity, nor sworn deceitfully." Ps. xxiv.

There is no evidence that this tabernacle and its spiritual worship were abandoned when Solomon removed the Ark to the temple. On the contrary, it is altogether probable that it still remained as a place of devotion to the deeply pious, and that it was imitated in other parts of the land. Here probably originated the idea of the synagogue which afterward went into such extensive use.

But the sad day came in the history of Israel when wickedness and degeneracy fell upon the people. They forsook the worship of God, until, like in the days of Elias, only a remnant remained true, and these, perchance, met in secret and "waited for the promise." Amid this degeneracy, the senseless devotion to ordinances, God raised up Amos to prophesy. Standing in the place where so many prophecies had been delivered—near the gate of the temple on Mount Moriah—this holy man first arraigned, exposed and condemned the sins of the people in forsaking the only acceptable worship of God. This done, he turned his eyes to Mount Zion, which was separated from Mount Moriah by a narrow valley, and there beheld the ruins of the tabernacle of David. Its history was well known to Israel. Pointing with one hand to the

place where a pure spiritual worship had been offered to God in other days, and with the other hand pointing down the stream of time to the coming Messiah, and the glorious restoration to be effected by him, he exclaimed: "In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old."

(3) Let us now consider the application of this prophecy to the Church, showing that the inspired Apostles understood it to mean the restoration of the Church to a simple and pure spiritual worship. If this can be shown, it forever destroys the claims of our opponents for the setting up, *de novo*, of a new Church. This we proceed to do. The Messiah had come and completed his great mission; he had ascended up on high and sent the Holy Spirit upon the Apostles; the Gospel had been preached, and thousands, both Jews and Gentiles, had been gathered into the Church, when a serious trouble arose concerning the ceremonial duties of the Levitical ritual. Certain mistaken teachers had gone to the Gentile convert and said: "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye can not be saved." (Acts xv. 1-5.) A question of vital importance thus arose, and "the Apostles and elders came together," in the first Christian Council, "to consider this matter." Paul and Barnabas went

from Antioch to Jerusalem to take part in the deliberations upon this important question, and, together with Peter, declared the wonderful results of the Gospel among the Gentiles. Let us assume ourselves present before that venerable body of inspired men, and propound to them the three questions concerning the Church which have agitated the world for ages. The first is the question of the Jew—the representative of the Ritualist—namely, “Do not the Levitical ceremonies, rites and ordinances perpetuate themselves in the Church and continue obligatory in all time?” The second is the question of the opponent of infant baptism—namely, “Has not a new Church, with new principles, a new Constitution, &c., been set up since the resurrection?” The third is the question which the advocates of infant baptism and of Church unity maintain—namely, “Has not the Church, founded upon the Abrahamic covenant, and offering a pure spiritual worship to God, continued through all ages and dispensations?”

Now, let us seek the answer to these questions at the mouth of that inspired Council. The Apostle James gives it: “Men and brethren, hearken unto me. Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name. And to this agree the words of the prophets [ Amos ix. 11 ], as it is written: after this I will re-

turn, and will build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen down ; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up ; that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all things well." Acts xv. 13-17. This shows the Jew, in answer to his question, that the Mosaic ritual formed no essential part of the Church of God at any time. The Church existed before that was given ; it existed as a pure, spiritual, non-ritual Church on Mount Zion while that ritual, with all that appertained to it, was observed at Gibeon ; and that the utter cessation of that ritual could not affect it in any wise for evil. Neither the coming in of these ordinances nor their departure affected the Church. The period of 1400 years, during which that ritual was of obligation, was but a brief parenthesis in the Church. The Church on Mount Zion—the tabernacle of David—holding on in its spiritual, non-ritual worship in the midst of an infinite ritualism, was a sublime *expose* of the character and Constitution of the Church of God in all ages. Thus fell forever sacrifice, a human priesthood, and an imposing ceremonial ; and the Church resumes her simple forms of preaching, song, and praise, which characterized her in the tabernacle of David. The answer to the opponent of infant baptism, as to whether "a new Church, with new princi-

ples and a new Constitution, was to be set up," is equally explicit. Instead of originating a new Church and a new worship, this inspired Council informs him that the Church, as it existed on Mount Zion, was to be simply restored and its ruins built up as in the days of old; and this is to be done "that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord." Into its ample folds the Gentiles, as seen in other prophecies quoted, are to be gathered. This answers the third question affirmatively, while it disproves both the former.

Thus it is shown that the Church of God continues one and the same through all economies. Rites may change, ordinances may be suspended, introduced, or cancelled; subordinate covenants may come in and be obligatory for centuries and then expire by limitation; but the Church, planted upon the immutable covenant with Abraham, which was confirmed in Christ, abides unchanged forever. The unalterable Constitution of this Church makes infants eligible to her membership and the initiatory rite thereof. Where do our opponents show the abrogation of this law? Nowhere!

## ARTICLE X.

THE TEXTS SUPPOSED TO MILITATE AGAINST THE  
UNITY OF THE CHURCH CONSIDERED (CONTINUED).  
DAN. II. 44; MAT. XVI. 18.

We shall close this investigation with the present number, in which we shall briefly examine the remaining texts relied on by the opponents of Church unity.

Daniel ii. 44.—“And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever.”

Here, it is assumed by our opponents, that the setting up a kingdom by the God of heaven means the founding or originating the Church of God after the crucifixion. The whole position is false, and the process of argumentation by which it is attempted to sustain it is at war with the teachings of Scripture and history. This assertion will be made plain by a brief examination of the passage, which we now propose.

Nebuchadnezzar dreamed that a great image stood before him, which is thus described: The head was of fine gold, the breast and arms of silver, the belly and thighs of brass, the legs of iron, the feet and toes

part of potters' clay and part iron. (Dan. ii. 31-41.) Here was a grand chronological image of monarchy, and is thus explained by all. The "head" is the Babylonian kingdom; the "breast and arms" is the Medo-Persian; the "belly and thighs" is the Macedonian under Alexander the Great; and the "legs and feet" is the Roman kingdom. Now, as a fact of history, which destroys the assumption of our opponents on this text, we observe:

(1) That these were all secular kingdoms, and each one in its turn was destroyed by a secular kingdom—not by the Church of God. Hence, whatever "the kingdom" which the God of heaven was to "set up in the days of these kings" may mean, one thing is certain, it can not mean the Church. For, in the first place, a work is assigned to this "kingdom" of the God of heaven which is utterly at variance with the oft proclaimed character of the Church. It is here declared that this "kingdom" "shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms"—a work which is utterly at war with what Christ said of his kingdom—namely: "My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight." (John xviii. 36.) It would not be compatible with the character of such a kingdom to "break in pieces and consume" the governments of this world. To attempt it would forfeit the character of the

Church. But, in the second place, it is an undeniable fact of history that each of the kingdoms symbolized in this image was overthrown and destroyed by secular kingdoms. Thus, the Babylonian kingdom, the head of the image, was destroyed by Cyrus about 560 years before Christ; the Medo-Persian kingdom, the "breast and arms" of the image, was destroyed by Alexander at the battle of Arbela, B. C. 331; the Macedonian kingdom, "the belly and thighs" of the image, was overthrown by the death of Alexander and the divisions and wars which ensued between his generals; and the Roman kingdom, the "legs and feet" of the image, was destroyed by the Northern hordes, who finished their work of ruin under the walls of Constantinople on the 29th May, 1453, at which time the last vestige of that empire was swept away. In point of fact, the "Church," which our opponents believe to be meant by the "kingdom" in this prophecy, never had any part in the overthrow of any of these kingdoms. This is sufficient to refute their claim, that the setting up of the Church is meant in this prophecy.

(2) The time for the setting up of this "kingdom" is too late to answer the purpose of the theory we oppose. It is generally conceded by the interpreters of this prophecy, that "the feet and toes, part of potters' clay and part of iron," (vr. 41) in this chronological image, symbolizes the politico-ecclesiastical papal

power. There are many things to justify this conclusion. As (*a*) there is perfect chronological order observed in this image—the “head,” “breast,” “thighs,” “legs,” and “feet,” symbolizing successive periods from 560 B. C. to 1053 A. D., the “feet and toes,” therefore, symbolize the last period in the Roman empire. And (*b*) the weakness in this empire, indicated by the “clay and iron” mixed together, was not realized until after the union of Church and State, consequent upon the conversion of Constantine in 313 A. D. Interpreters generally agree that the “clay and iron” period in the image symbolized the union of Church and State in the Roman empire. But this did not take place, as above seen, until in the fourth century. Hence this image of monarchy was not prepared for destruction until this period in its development was reached.

Lastly. (*c*) The “stone” was not “cut out of the mountain,” nor was “the kingdom set up,” until the chronological image was completed. This is manifest from the statement in verse 34. Daniel said to the King: “Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them to pieces.” Mark the expression—“thou sawest till that,” *i. e.*, “thou continuedst to look along down the stream of time until, the image being completed, thou sawest a

stone cut out without hands." Now, the kingdom was not set up until the image was completed and the "stone cut out." But this brings us to the fourth century of the Christian era, and consequently too late for the purposes of the theory we oppose.

(3) The word employed by Daniel, rendered "set up," does not signify to originate. Our opponents assume it does. Let us now to the proof. This part of Daniel's prophecy is written in the Chaldee language, and the word used by him is *y' kim*, which Furst defines "to raise out of misfortune; commonly to confirm, to establish; to rebuild; to make, revive, to awaken to life; to reanimate; to give a firm position to; to restore, to erect again; to be established; to endure, to remain," &c. When Daniel's book was translated into Greek, the word *ἀναστῆσαι* (*anastesei*) was employed to translate the Chaldee word. Liddell and Scott thus define it: "To make to stand up, wake up, restore, rouse to action, to build up again." Here, as we have seen in other instances, a restoration simply is contemplated, not a creation. If it refers to the Church at all, it contemplates simply a reformation from abuses. Whether it does so refer or not, the period at which the event seen by Nebuchadnezzar is centuries too late for the cause of our opponents. This "kingdom" was "set up" in the days of the weakness of the Roman empire when its "iron"

power had been weakened by ecclesiastical union and broils. But at the time of the crucifixion, the period when our opponents assume the Church was originated, the Roman empire was at the zenith of its strength and glory. The splendor of the Augustan age then rested upon her invincible arms and triumphant laws. This text, therefore, gives them no support whatever.

There is one other—namely, Matt. xvi. 18: “And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” After what has been shown concerning similar passages we need not dwell on this. The theory which we oppose assumes that by the words “I will build my Church,” Christ meant to say he would originate a church, or would bring into existence that which had no previous existence. There never was an assumption more utterly groundless. Out of such assumption concerning these words many of the grossest errors and most blasphemous pretensions of the Church of Rome have arisen. Our opponents have not fallen far behind Rome in the abuse of this text. An examination of it will show that it furnishes them no support. The word rendered “build” in this verse is *οἰκοδομήσω* (*oikodomēsō*), and is defined by the lexicons thus: Liddell and Scott, “to edify,” N. T. Groves, “to edify, instruct, im-

prove, profit, to embolden, encourage." Robinson "to rebuild, to renew, to build up, to establish, to confirm, spoken of the Christian Church and its members, who are thus compared to a building, a temple of God erected upon the one only foundation Jesus Christ, and ever built up progressively and unceasingly more and more from the foundation." This is the prevailing sense in which the word is used. We give a few examples. Jer. xxx. 18: "And the city shall be builded (*oikodomeo*) upon her own heap." Here was restoration, not origin. Matt. xxvi. 61: "I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it (*oikodomeo*) in three days." Acts ix. 31: "Then had the Churches rest. . . . and were edified"—(*oikodomeo*). The word used by the Savior, it is thus seen, means to rebuild, restore, establish. If we now consider the circumstances under which this language was used, this meaning of the word must be apparent. There had been a great apostasy on the part of the rulers and many of the people. Degeneracy and corruption lifted their heads every where. In the midst of this terrible state of affairs the Messiah appeared in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. But the apostates rejected him and sought his life. Every where he met with a powerful, organized resistance. Looked at from a merely human stand-point, his fortunes seemed hopeless. "Many of his disciples went back, and

walked no more with him," (John vi. 66.) But in this day of gloom Peter stood up and said, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Jesus replied, "Upon this rock [*i. e.*, upon the truth here confessed] I will build [restore, reanimate, establish] my Church." Hopeless as seemed the enterprise, when considered from a human stand-point, yet the truth that Jesus of Nazareth is "the Christ, the Son of the living God," shall be the rallying point of the Church, and from it she shall derive strength which "the gates of hell" can not resist. This is the import of this text. It contains no intimation of a new organization. It simply announces the restoration to power and glory of the already existing Church of God, effected by the great truth which Peter had confessed.

Thus we have examined the only texts upon which our opponents rely to disprove the unity and sameness of the Church, and have seen that, instead of refuting this position, they all declare a restoration, a renewal, of the Church of God to power and glory at the coming of the Messiah. No "new Church" was erected. This is but a waking dream of those who despise the Bible truth of infant baptism. It thus appears that the Church founded upon the covenant with Abraham, and which for nineteen hundred years, in administering the law of that covenant, received infants to membership and gave them the token thereof,

is the Church of God to-day, with no change in her great constitutional law or in her subjects. This being true, infant baptism follows inevitably as the law of God's Church now.

We shall close this investigation by showing that a contrary supposition, *i. e.*, that infant baptism and infant church-membership is not the law of God's Church, is a modern invention, the child of fanaticism, born of the wildest heresy of modern times and nursed upon the bosom of hate toward everything pure and good in the Church of God. Where does the first organized resistance to infant baptism appear in the history of the past? We answer, in Germany, among the fanatical Anabaptists, about the beginning of the sixteenth century. We fix this as the first organized resistance to infant baptism. For while it is true that some spasmodic instances of resistance to this apostolic custom of the Church do appear a little before this, it is also true that those instances fell without an echo. The Petrobrussians had opposed it in A. D. 1150, but not upon the ground which the present opponents of it assign for their opposition. They (the Petrobrussians) opposed it upon the ground that infants, baptized or unbaptized, are not fit for the kingdom of God. Wall says of them: "The first body of men we read of that did deny baptism to infants, which were the Petrobrussians, Anno Domini 1150, did it

upon a ground or reason which they held common with these men, viz.: that infants, baptized or unbaptized, are incapable of the kingdom of heaven." (I. 318.)

Concerning the author of this sect, Peter de Bruys, Mosheim thus speaks: "The whole system of doctrines which this unhappy martyr, whose zeal was not without a considerable mixture of fanaticism, taught to the Petrobrussians, his disciples, is not known." (Ch. Hist. Pt. 11, p. 289.) Like those who followed him in his opposition to infant baptism, he was a fanatic, as faithful history deposes. Among other evidences of this the following is conclusive: "He maintained that it is superstitious to build churches, and that those erected ought to be demolished." (Watson's Bib. Dic.) With Peter de Bruys this opposition was a part of an extensive fanaticism. But his opposition fell without an echo, and the silence on this question of opposition which had rested upon the Church from the Apostolic age was resumed and reigned supreme for three hundred and fifty years longer. This brings us to the origin of this opposition which, under one form and another, has continued to the present time. The great Reformation under Luther began about the opening of the sixteenth century. Grand and glorious as was that work, yet it was the occasion (innocent) of many excesses

in doctrine and practice. Once the human mind is loosened from the moorings of centuries, it is to be expected that ignorant and fanatical men will plunge into the wildest extremes. So it was in this Reformation. While Luther and his co-laborers held grandly on in their work of redeeming the Church from papal abuses, many ignorant men plunged into excesses which threatened to thwart the labors of the great Reformer. Prominent among these were Louis Hetzer, Balthazar Hubmeyer, Felix Mentz, Conrad Grebel, Melchior Hoffman, and George Jacob. These men were the fathers of the Anabaptist sect, in which the present opposition to infant baptism originated. There is but one voice in history concerning that sect, and that is, they were a lawless, licentious, turbulent body of fanatics, whose lives were filled up with the most revolting enormities and flagitious villainies. Mosheim says of them: "It is difficult to determine, with certainty, the particular spot that gave birth to that seditious and pestilential sect of Anabaptists, whose tumultuous and desperate attempts were equally pernicious to the cause of religion and the civil interests of mankind. . . . The most pernicious faction of all those that composed this motley multitude was the sect which pretended that the founders of the new and perfect Church, already mentioned, were under the direction of a divine impulse, and were

armed against all opposition by the power of working miracles. It was this detestable faction that, in 1521, began their fanatical work, under the guidance of Munzer, Stubner, Stork, and other leaders of the same furious complexion in Saxony and adjacent countries. They employed at first the various arts of persuasion, in order to propagate their doctrine. They preached, exhorted, admonished, and reasoned, in a manner that seemed proper to gain the multitude, and related a great number of visions and revelations, with which they pretended to have been favored from above. But when they saw that these methods of making proselytes were not attended with such rapid success as they fondly expected, and that the ministry of Luther and other eminent reformers proved detrimental to their cause, they had recourse to more expeditious measures, and madly attempted to propagate their fanatical doctrine by force of arms. Munzer and his associates assembled in 1525 a numerous army, chiefly composed of the peasants of Suabia, Thuringia, Franconia, and Saxony, and, at the head of this credulous and deluded rabble, declared war against all laws, governments, and magistrates of every kind, under the chimerical pretext that Christ was now to take the reins of civil and ecclesiastical government into his own hands, and to rule alone over the nations. . . . Those who distinguished themselves by the enormity

of their conduct in this infamous sect, were Louis Hetzer, Balthazar Hubmeyer, Feliz Mentz, Conrad Grebel, Melchior Hoffman, and George Jacob, who, if their power had seconded their designs, would have involved all Switzerland, Holland, and Germany in tumult and bloodshed. A great part of this rabble seemed really delirious; and nothing more extravagant and incredible can be imagined than the dreams and visions that were constantly arising in their disordered brains." (Mosh. Church Hist. Pt. II. p. 492, 493.) This was the origin of the Baptist Church and of organized opposition to infant baptism. The pages of history show no instance before this of a body that opposed it, except the spasmodic and ephemeral opposition of the Petrobrussians in the twelfth century. The facts, therefore, furnished by the history of the past with reference to infant baptism, are, that during the first twelve hundred years of the Christian era no body styling itself a Church ever lifted a voice against it. A few followers of a fanatic in Provence and Languedoc, Peter de Bruys, did, about the opening of the twelfth century, oppose it, as they opposed many other things most sacred and essential to the Church. But this body sunk into oblivion with its ill-fated leader, and for three hundred and fifty years thereafter no one echoed the opposition of this sect. Then, in the first half of the sixteenth century, arose the ec-

clesiastico-political sect of Anabaptists, from whom the present Baptist Church has descended, whose turbulence and crimes ultimately brought the arm of civil authority upon them, to save the country from bloodshed and ruin, and by them the present opposition to infant baptism was originated! Let our opponents disprove this if they can.

We have now passed over the field of investigation which we marked out in the beginning. The argument is before the reader. It might have been elaborated more, but we doubt whether this would have added to the clear and comprehensive view which we wished the reader to have. Let him now weigh the facts presented from Scripture and history, and then ask himself on which side of the question is the truth. After some little experience in the investigation of the customs and practices of the Church of God, we hesitate not to say, that there are many matters of doctrine and practice held to be true and sacred by all denominations which, if assailed, could not array in their behalf as much testimony as we have here adduced for infant baptism, to save the world.

In conclusion, let me address one word to those whose Church furnishes the privilege of dedicating their children to God as the Bible has authorized. In many places the failure of the pulpit to instruct the congregation upon this duty, and in other places the

storm of relentless persecution against this duty, has caused it to be greatly and shamefully neglected. Let me exhort those who have this privilege allowed them to bring their "little children" to Christ "and forbid them not." Lay them confidingly in the arms of Jesus; carefully place them in the fold of the great Shepherd. Let bigots rave and fanatics hiss. Thus they raved and hissed at the man who, on his way to the block and the ax, said, "I am ready to be offered up." Thus they have raved and hissed at the men and women in all the past who preferred the ax, the stake, and the gibbet to a compromise with infidelity. As well might these holy men and women have quailed before the storm and abandoned duty, as for you, because of opposition. Do your duty. And as you hope to press these dear little ones back to your heart, warm with eternal life, when the night of the grave yields to the morning of heaven, so now consecrate them to God in holy baptism, and then train them up "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."









